REPORT RESUMES

ED 003 707 24

FACTORS RELATED TO FACULTY DESEGREGATION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

BY- MORRIS, EDDIE W.
KENTUCKY UNIV., LEXINGTON

REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-176 PUB DATE 65
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.36 HC-$9.16 229P.

DESCRIPTORS- *FACULTY INTEGRATION, *INTEGRATION METHODS, *COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, *NEGRO TEACHERS, INTERVIEWS, PRINCIPALS, SUPERINTENDENTS, *PUBLIC SCHOOLS, SOCIAL PROBLEMS, SOUTHERN STATES, COMMUNITY INFLUENCE, LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

CERTAIN FACTORS AFFECTING FACULTY DESEGREGATION SUCH AS DESEGREGATION PREPARATION, TEACHER PERCEPTION AND QUALIFICATION, COMMUNITY STRUCTURE, AND SCHOOL FACILITIES WERE STUDIED. THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE CONSISTED OF TWO PARTS. PART ONE WAS DESIGNED TO INVESTIGATE PREPARATION, UTILIZATION, ASSIGNMENT, AND OBSERVATIONS. PART TWO WAS DESIGNED TO DETERMINE THE ORDER OF SELECTED EXPERIENCES WITH FACULTY DESEGREGATION. THE SUBJECTS CONSISTED OF 41 SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS, 54 PRINCIPALS, 180 NEGRO TEACHERS, AND 135 WHITE TEACHERS. INTERVIEWS WERE CONDUCTED WITH ALL OF THE SUBJECTS. THE REPORT INCLUDED DISCUSSIONS OF (1) THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF SEGREGATION AND THE TRANSITION TO DESEGREGATION, (2) REVIEW OF LITERATURE RELATED TO FACULTY DESEGREGATION, (3) BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENTS IN FACULTY DESEGREGATION IN KENTUCKY, AND (4) ANALYSIS OF FACTORS RELATED TO FACULTY DESEGREGATION. THE RESULTS INDICATED THAT FEW PROBLEMS HAVE RESULTED FROM THE TRANSITION TO DESEGREGATED FACULTIES, AND THAT NEGRO AND WHITE TEACHERS PROVED CAPABLE OF WORKING TOGETHER. (RS)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

RULES FOR THE USE OF THESES

Unpublished theses submitted for the masters and doctors degrees and deposited in the University of Kentucky Library are as a rule open for inspection, but are to be used only with due regard to the rights of the authors. Bibliographical references may be noted, but quotations or summaries of parts may be published only with the permission of the author, and with the usual scholarly acknowledgments.

Extensive copying or publication of the thesis in whole or in part requires also the consent of the Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Kentucky.

A library which borrows this thesis for use by its patrons is expected to secure the signature of each user.

Name and Address	Date

ED 003707

DISSERTATION

Eddie W. Morris, M.A. in Education

Graduate School

University of Kentucky

1965

S-176

FACTORS RELATED TO FACULTY DESEGREGATION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DISSERTATION

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of *Doctor of Education at the*
University of Kentucky

By

EDDIE W. MORRIS

Augusta, Georgia

Director: Dr. Leo M. Chamberlain, Professor of Education

Lexington, Kentucky

1965

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Much assistance and guidance was provided the writer from various sources during this study. Dr. Leo M. Chamberlain, who served as chairman of the doctoral committee, gave unselfishly of his time and skills in directing this study. Dr. Morris B. Cierley provided many suggestions and much information that were of invaluable aid to the writer.

Other members of the doctoral committee, Dr. John M. Carpenter, Dr. Raymond E. Hampton, and Dr. James B. Kincheloe, shared many ideas and provided much assistance in various ways throughout this study.

School administrators and teachers gave willingly of their time and knowledge in answering the many queries put to them.

The writer is deeply indebted to his wife, Ruthie, and his mother, Mrs. W. Ruth Green, for understanding problems and providing encouragement and incentive during the entire period of graduate study and research.

The grant from the Cooperative Research Program of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, without which this study would have been impossible, is deeply appreciated.

To all of those named, and many who are unnamed, the writer wishes to express sincere appreciation for the help and assistance given him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES vii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Need for the Study 2
Purpose of the Study 5
Rationale of the Study 6
Definitions 9
Delimitations 9
Basic Assumptions 10
Methodology of the Study 10
Procedure Followed in the Development of the Interview Schedule 11
Procedure for Choosing Interviewees 13
Procedure for Collecting Data 14
Validation of Data 16
Procedure in the Treatment of Data 16

II. AN OVERVIEW OF SEGREGATION AND DESEGREGATION IN PUBLIC EDUCATION 18

Segregation in Public Education Prior to 1954 19
Segregation and Desegregation following the Supreme Court Decision of 1954 24
Patterns of Reaction to the Decision of 1954 27
Desegregation at the Administrative and Professional Organization Levels 33
Effects of School Desegregation on Teachers 35
Legal Aspects of Faculty Desegregation 38
Chapter Summary 40

III. REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RESEARCH RELATED TO FACULTY DESEGREGATION 42

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

Chapter Page

General Literature 43
Literature Directly Related to Faculty Desegregation . . . 50

IV. DESEGREGATION IN PUBLIC EDUCATION IN KENTUCKY. . 58

Desegregation of Higher Education in Kentucky. 60
Desegregation of Students in the Public Schools 61
Developments in Faculty Desegregation. 63
Tenure of Teachers 66
Pattern of Placement of Negro Teachers 71
Legal Aspects 73
The Status of Faculty Desegregation 75
The Present Status of Faculty Desegregation in Other Border States 79
Chapter Summary. 80

V. PREPARATION FOR FACULTY DESEGREGATION 81

The Decision to Desegregate Faculties 82
Methods of Determining Readiness 87
Community Preparation 89
Student Preparation 94
Teacher Preparation. 96
Plans for Handling Objections to Negro Teachers 99
Method of Choice of Negro Teachers 102
Plan for the Initial Assignment of Negro Teachers 105
Plans for the Assignment of Additional Negro Teachers . . 107
Statement of Policy. 112
Evaluation of Preparation Procedures 113
Techniques Utilized in the Desegregation of Faculties . . . 119
Community Conditions that Facilitated the Change to Desegregated Faculties. 121
Factors that Retarded the Transition to Desegregated Faculties 127

VI. QUALIFICATIONS, ASSIGNMENTS, PERCEPTIONS, AND SATISFACTION OF TEACHERS ASSIGNED TO DESEGREGATED FACULTIES 130

Qualifications and Assignments 130

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

Chapter Page

General Characteristics 132
Professional Training 132
Assignments of Negro Teachers 134
Extra-Class Assignments and Positions of Negro Teachers 139
Perceptions of Teachers Concerning Conditions in Desegregated Faculties 142
Teacher-Student Relations 142
Parent-Teacher Relations 148
Preparation Procedures 152
Sources of Apprehension 153
Social Relations of Teachers 155
Extra-School Fraternization 156
Teacher Satisfaction with Faculty Desegregation 158
Most Satisfying Aspects 158
Less Satisfying Aspects 164
Satisfaction with General Conditions 168
Correlates of Satisfaction 172
Chapter Summary 177

VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . 180

Summary 180
Conclusions 187
Implications 190
Recommendations 192

APPENDICES 193

BIBLIOGRAPHY 211

LIST OF TABLES

Table — Page

1. Accumulation of School Districts in Kentucky with Desegregated Faculties during the Years 1956-1957 to 1963-1964 70

2. Number of Public School Districts in Kentucky with Desegregated Faculties and Students in 1963-1964 78

3. Primary Reasons for the Decision to Desegregate Faculties in Thirty-Eight School Districts in Kentucky 83

4. Methods Used by Administrators for Determining Readiness for Faculty Desegregation in Thirty-Eight School Districts in Kentucky. 90

5. Procedures Utilized by Administrators to Prepare Communities for Faculty Desegregation in Thirty-Eight School Districts in Kentucky 91

6. Procedures Reported by Administrators that Served to Prepare Teachers for Faculty Desegregation. 98

7. Method of Selection of Negro Teachers that Initiated Faculty Desegregation in Thirty-Eight School Districts in Kentucky. 103

8. Attitude of Administrators of Thirty-Eight School Districts in Kentucky toward the Employment of Additional Negro Teachers for Desegregated Faculties 109

9. Administrators' Evaluation of the Degree of Success of Faculty Desegregation in Thirty-Eight School Districts in Kentucky. 116

10. The Relationship of Administrators' Evaluation of Success with Faculty Desegregation and the Utilization of Preparation Procedures 117

LIST OF TABLES—Continued

Table Page

11. Number and Rank of Techniques Listed by Administrators as Being Most Useful in Preparing for Faculty Desegregation in Thirty-Eight School Districts in Kentucky 120

12. Number and Rank of Community Conditions that Facilitated the Change to Desegregated Faculties in Thirty-Eight School Districts in Kentucky 126

13. Age of 315 Teachers Serving in Desegregated Faculties in Kentucky Classified by Race and Sex 131

14. Professional Training of 315 Teachers Serving in Desegregated Faculties in the Public Schools of Kentucky 133

15. Positions in Which 180 Negro Teachers Are Serving in Desegregated Faculties in the Public Schools of Kentucky 135

16. Present and Prior Assignment of 180 Negro Teachers Serving in Desegregated Faculties in the Public Schools of Kentucky 136

17. Positions Held in Professional Organizations and Parent-Teacher Associations by 103 Teachers of Desegregated Faculties in the Public Schools of Kentucky 140

18. Extent of Student Initiated Verbal Contact between Teachers and Students Reported by 315 Teachers of Desegregated Faculties in the Public Schools of Kentucky 143

19. Extent of Interaction with Homeroom Classes' Parents Reported by 315 Teachers of Desegregated Faculties in the Public Schools of Kentucky 149

20. Sources of Apprehension Concerning Faculty Desegregation of Teachers Serving in Desegregated Faculties in the Public Schools of Kentucky 154

LIST OF TABLES—Continued

Table | Page

21. Actual and Desirable Extra-School Fraternization Reported by 315 Teachers Serving in Desegregated Faculties in the Public Schools of Kentucky 158

22. Rank Assigned Nine Satisfying Aspects of Desegregated Faculties by 315 Teachers Serving in Desegregated Faculties in the Public Schools of Kentucky 160

23. Rank Assigned Nine Satisfying Aspects of Desegregated Faculties by 315 Teachers of Desegregated Faculties in Kentucky Classified by Size of School District 167

24. Responses of 315 Teachers Serving in Desegregated Faculties in the Public Schools of Kentucky to Ten Statements Concerning Satisfaction with the Desegregation of Faculties 169

25. Responses of Teachers Serving in Desegregated Faculties to Six Statements Concerning Satisfaction with Faculty Desegregation Classified by Teaching Level, Amount of Training, and Type of School Attended 173

26. Responses of Teachers Serving in Desegregated Faculties in Kentucky to Six Statements Concerning Satisfaction with Faculty Desegregation Classified by Age, District Size, and Percentage of Negroes in School 175

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The dramatic social revolution that is taking place in America today has created attendant problems that will require many and varied solutions. Our American democratic society, with its myriad cultural and social backgrounds, in this period of deep and far-reaching changes, is faced with the imperative of reordering and restructuring basic relationships so that all members of the national body may share equally in the American Dream. One aspect of this social revolution is the desegregation of the schools. This process has accounted for much of the stress and tension that has accompanied efforts to alter social relationships between races that have caste-like characteristics.

The firm belief of most Americans in the principles of equality and justice upon which this nation was founded has overridden many fears, anxieties, and prejudices that have contributed to the reluctance to begin the process of school desegregation. Increasing awareness that democratic principles demand that equal opportunity be accorded to all individuals without regard for superficial racial characteristics has resulted in much school desegregation and integration. In this movement toward the desegregation of schools, faculty desegregation has proceeded at a much slower pace than student desegregation. More resistant attitudes by communities toward faculty desegregation has been given as the reason for this lag. The existence of attitudes of resistance toward faculty desegregation does not negate the principle that true desegregation must include teachers as well as students. School and community officials bear the responsibility of assuming leadership roles in preparing for faculty desegregation as well as implementing the process. The kind of leadership behaviors exhibited by these leaders will determine in large measure the extent to which the embodiment of democratic concepts is reflected in desegregation practices.

Need for the Study

Many leaders have expressed the belief that even in a border state, such as Kentucky, desegregation of faculties is much more of a problem than desegregation of pupils. The belief that there would be much greater resistance to Negro teachers teaching white pupils than to having classes of racially mixed pupils has operated to keep the assignment of Negro teachers to white faculties at a minimum level in many communities. Other communities have preferred to release Negro teachers rather than breach the existing social norms.

As pupil desegregation becomes more than a token mixing of a few Negro students in predominantly white schools and a few white pupils scattered in predominantly Negro schools, administrators will find the problem of faculty desegregation an increasingly pressing one. In smaller school systems, as more and more Negro pupils attend previously all-white schools, administrators find that it is costly indeed to operate Negro schools that are attended by fewer pupils in order to provide employment for Negro teachers. Thus, administrators are faced with the problem of desegregating their faculties, dismissing the Negro teachers, or relegating them to some relatively insignificant position that is in keeping with neither their talent nor training. Tenure laws and pressure from Civil Rights groups add to the urgency of this problem.

Many administrators who desire to begin faculty desegregation may hesitate because of fear of community reactions. The many books and reports written about school desegregation have taken only a cursory look at faculty desegregation. The lack of adequate information suggesting effective methods of implementing the change has contributed to the reluctance of school leaders to begin faculty desegregation.

There are, no doubt, many school boards, superintendents, and other administrators who feel professionally obligated to desegregate faculties but lack a design or plan for going about it and have little information concerning factors influencing the desegregation process. The information that can be gained from a study of the kind undertaken would be of much value to these school leaders.

A study by Gandy indicates that Negro teachers work in an atmosphere of anxiety.[1] Looking at the statistics regarding the number of teachers dismissed as a result of desegregation in the border states and the reduced hiring of Negro teachers, they are not sure just what the future holds for them. They do not know what the chances are that they will retain their jobs. Even if they feel that they will be employed in a desegregated faculty their anxiety remains for they do not know what kind of treatment to expect from administrators, faculty, students, and parents. They may also be concerned about additional preparation that they need to be making in order to become as efficient and effective as possible in the new situation. This research, it is hoped, will make it possible for teachers to avail themselves of knowledge concerning preparation, problems, and conditions to be expected in desegregated faculties.

Education has suffered in the southern region due to a shortage of qualified competent teachers. A recent survey revealed that 13,586 teachers in the border region had less-than-standard certificates.[2] In Kentucky there were 2,100 teachers with substandard certificates in 1962. Nearly all Negro teachers are qualified by certification.[3] These teachers are in an excellent position to help alleviate the problem of teacher shortages. This study is needed to help clear up cloudy and vague notions regarding faculty desegregation, thus making it possible for the needs of youth to be served more adequately.

---

[1] Willard E. Gandy, "Implications of Integration for the Southern Negro Teacher," Journal of Negro Education, XXXI (April, 1962), 191-197.

[2] Carol J. Hobson and Samuel Schloss, Enrollment, Teachers, and Schoolhousing (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1962, Circular No. 703), p. 13.

Research of this nature is needed from a theoretical as well as a practical standpoint. Many individuals not directly connected with school desegregation have indicated the need for research of this type. Deutsch, a social scientist, points out the possibilities of research in the area of desegregation and integration:

> Desegregation in the border areas still offers the possibility of establishing predictive equations that can smooth the process of social transition when the Deep South starts desegregating. . . . We can only hope that before much more time goes and the rich possibilities here become lost support will be received for the kind of coordinated research programs which will be most fruitful.[4]

Dodson adds support to the observation of Deutsch:

> There is an urgent need for experimentation and study of the accumulated experiences to determine what principles of integration can be discovered. . . . In this fight for democracy we will need all the art and what science we can muster, mixed generously with great spiritual and moral commitment to win the fight.[5]

---

[3] A. Lee Coleman, "Desegregation of Public Schools in Kentucky—One Year Afterwards," Journal of Negro Education, XXIV (Spring, 1955), p. 256.

[4] Martin Deutsch, "Some Perspectives on Desegregation Research," The Role of Social Sciences in Desegregation: A Symposium (New York: Anti-Defamation League B'nai B'rith, 1956), p. 6.

[5] Dan W. Dodson, "Toward Integration," The Journal of Educational Sociology, XXVII (October, 1954), pp. 50, 58.

Suchman et al.[6] point to the need and possibilities of research on phases of the desegregation process. They say, "The product of research on desegregation, therefore, has an excellent opportunity to be both basic and practical. Reports of projects could include both theoretical significance and practical implications."

There is ample evidence that a study of faculty desegregation is pertinent and needed. The need for a study of this type is summarized in the following statements:

1. A study that presents certain facts about faculty desegregation and the factors that influence it would be of much help to those individuals charged with the responsibility of planning for and implementing faculty desegregation.

2. There is a gap in the broad field of knowledge concerning the educative process. The many books written concerning the school desegregation process have given only cursory attention to faculty desegregation. This research seeks to provide a body of knowledge that will help to fill that gap arising from lack of information about faculty desegregation and provide a stimulus to further research in this field.

3. Education will thrive and flourish to the extent that able, intelligent, and alert minds are brought into and remain in education. A research study that throws additional light on factors that can contribute to better race relations helps make it possible for all keen, intelligent, competent minds to continue to serve in the education profession, regardless of the color of the persons possessing them.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate selected factors that are related to the process of faculty desegregation. Many factors impinge upon the desegregation process. Some of these factors are population ratio, sub-region, general economic situation, kind of school buildings and attitude and general state of mind of people. Within the context of the community conditions listed above there are other factors that are related to the process of faculty desegregation that will exert influence on the change.

---

[6] Edward A. Suchman et al., Desegregation: Some Propositions and Research Suggestions (New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1958), p. 77.

Success in the change from segregated to desegregated faculties, as is true of desegregation in general, is dependent to a large extent on the position and action taken by school leaders in planning for and executing the change. It is also recognized that the process revolves around teachers. It is they who come in direct contact with each other and with students and parents most often. The kind of relationships that develop will be due in large measure to the perceptions, attitudes, preparation, and satisfaction of teachers serving in desegregated faculties.

An investigation of the scope of this one could not possibly study all or a majority of the factors that are related to the desegregation of faculties. Therefore, the following factors have been selected for investigation:

1. The kind and extent of preparation for faculty desegregation.
2. The professional qualifications and assignments of teachers serving on desegregated faculties.
3. The perception of teachers regarding the prevailing conditions in desegregated faculties.
4. Teacher satisfaction with faculty desegregation.

Rationale of the Study

Local school leaders and teachers are in a position to provide positive leadership in the process of faculty desegregation. This leadership will be successful to the extent that thought and preparation precede the move to desegregate faculties. Corey and Wey,[7] in a discussion of the necessity for preparation for desegregation, conclude that " . . .an extensive, on-the-spot research points up the necessity for at least some preparing, either through overt or subtle means."

---

[7] John Corey and Herbert Wey, Action Patterns in School Desegregation (Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa, 1959), p. 7.

Suchman[8] infers the need for definite planning and preparing:

> Where policy makers on the national, state, or community level have made the decision to desegregate, there is reason to believe that orderly desegregation can take place. . . . Where a policy of desegregation is firmly administered, people tend eventually to concede the legitimacy of the policy, while they may or may not abandon their personal prejudices against it.

Hansen,[9] in his analysis of the desegregation process in the District of Columbia, credited much of the success to preparation. His statement that "preparation is the key-word for the first section [of the desegregation process]" serves as additional evidence of the need for a definite plan of action in making the transition from segregation to desegregation.

The quoted statements indicate the extent to which programs of preparation that include decision-making, firm policy statements, and definite plans of operation may influence the process of faculty desegregation.

The placement, assignment, and perception of teachers, as well as the degree and kind of teacher-teacher and teacher-student interaction, determine in large measure the degree of satisfaction derived from teaching in a desegregated faculty. Teachers do their best work when they feel that they are serving as full members of an organization and are carrying their share of the work. The placement of teachers in part-time or full-time teaching positions determines the extent of meaningful direct contact among Negro teachers and white teachers, students and parents. These contacts serve to define the kind of interaction that takes place. Mackenzie reports that interaction between Negroes and whites of equal status in situations of social contact is usually accompanied by a reduction in hostility and prejudice.[10] Interaction produces acceptance, identification, and understanding.

---

[8] Suchman, op. cit., p. 60.

[9] Carl F. Hansen, "Desegregation in the District of Columbia," in William W. Brickman and Stanley Lehrer, The Countdown on Segregated Education (New York: Society for the Advancement of Education, 1960), p. 70.

No attempt was made to formulate hypotheses to be tested due to the exploratory nature of this study. The primary purpose is to determine the status of conditions.

There are several sub-problems or objectives that will be investigated. These are:

1. To review and analyze from an historical perspective developments in faculty desegregation in public education in the southern region and in the state of Kentucky.
2. To determine factors that have influenced the decision to desegregate faculties.
3. To study procedures that have been utilized in determining readiness and preparing communities, teachers, and students for the transition to desegregated faculties.
4. To determine the extent of objections and the techniques that have been utilized in handling objections to Negro teachers.
5. To determine the community conditions that have facilitated the transition to desegregated faculties.
6. To study the professional qualifications and assignments of teachers serving in desegregated faculties.
7. To determine how teachers perceive their experiences with faculty desegregation.
8. To determine the aspects of faculty desegregation that teachers have found most satisfying, and the extent of satisfaction of teachers with the general conditions found in desegregated faculties.

---

[10] Barbara K. MacKenzie, "The Importance of Contact in Determining Attitudes toward Negroes," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, XLIII (October, 1948), pp. 417-441.

Definitions

For better understanding the following definitions are set forth.

Border states—The states of Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, and West Virginia.

Desegregation—The process of bringing Negro and white pupils and/or teachers into the same schools.

Integration—The interaction and participation of whites and Negroes in the same activities on an equal-status basis with a maximum of cooperation.

Southern Region—The seventeen border and southern states and the District of Columbia.

Southern states—The states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

Delimitations

This study is confined to the public school districts of Kentucky that have desegregated faculties. The move toward desegregated faculties in the border states is a relatively recent one. There is not an excessive number of districts that have desegregated faculties, but there is a sufficient number to make this study valid.

This study is further limited in that it is virtually impossible to study all of the factors that impinge on the process of faculty desegregation in a community or school district. For example, the attitude of the power structure and lay leaders in a community will have much influence on the decision to desegregate faculties and on the general attitude toward acceptance of faculty desegregation.

The factors studied are those chosen by the writer on the basis of literature perused and conversations held with teachers, administrators, and professors. It appeared that the factors chosen for study are significant and deserved investigation.

There are two other limitations to this study. First, the topic of desegregation is a highly emotional one in these racially tense times. This means that individuals respond to queries not only with facts, per se, but with facts as they see them. The second limitation is related to the first. This investigation calls for opinion in many places. Opinion in itself is generally conceded to be unreliable in that it is usually biased in some way. But the opinion of individuals regarding faculty desegregation in their institutions indicates an awareness or lack of awareness of problem situations, as well as the degree of satisfaction being derived from desegregated faculties.

Basic Assumptions

Since no two school districts are exactly alike there is variation in the amount of preparation for faculty desegregation.

Teachers and administrators can give information concerning faculty desegregation for they are directly involved in the process.

School leaders, teachers, and other interested individuals need to know the facts about faculty desegregation in their state if they are to work intelligently toward the provision of both equal educational opportunity and equal employment opportunity.

Methodology of the Study

After the decision was made to investigate factors related to faculty desegregation, the next step was to determine if there were enough cases in Kentucky to sufficiently validate the study. A study of reports from the Kentucky State Department of Education revealed that 43 school districts had desegregated faculties (1963-1964). Approximately 2,290 white teachers and 240 Negro teachers were assigned to schools with desegregated faculties in these districts. Convinced that there were enough cases to constitute valid findings, the writer next decided on a method of collection of data. The methods chosen for the collection of data were historical research and interview.

The method of historical research was chosen in order to determine background factors and conditions leading to faculty desegregation. The interview method of gathering primary data was used. The realization that the subject chosen for investigation is one where the intentions of an investigator might be misinterpreted, or questions that were probing might be avoided led to the choice of the interview method.

Procedure Followed in the Development of the Interview Schedule

Books, reports, and conversations held with teachers, principals, and professors were used to determine questions to be used in the interview schedule. The research design called for superintendents, principals, and teachers to be interviewed. Due to different information being desired from administrators and teachers, it was necessary to construct two interview schedules. The schedule that was prepared for teachers consisted of two parts. One part of the schedule was designed to investigate preparation, utilization, assignment, and observations. The second part of the interview schedule for teachers was designed to determine the rank-order of selected experiences with faculty desegregation and ratings of other experiences.

The interview schedule for administrators was designed primarily to investigate preparation procedures, placement policies, and evaluations of procedures used. Opinions of community conditions that facilitated the desegregation of faculties were also reported on this schedule.

The first form of the interview schedules was completed then administered to three teachers who were members of desegregated faculties. These teachers made several recommendations for the revision of the instruments. Forms of the administrator schedule and the teacher schedule were submitted to two professors of the University of Kentucky, the Executive Director of the Kentucky School Board Association, the Assistant Director of the Division of Instructional Services of the Kentucky State Department of Education, and a high school principal of a school with a desegregated faculty.

These gentlemen made several suggestions for the improvement of both schedules. The suggestions of all individuals consulted were utilized in a subsequent revision of the schedules. A trial run revealed that it took 31 minutes to complete an interview with a teacher and approximately 35 minutes to complete an interview with an administrator.

The interview form for teachers had many possible responses to each item listed in order to reduce the amount of writing necessary during the interview. The administrator schedule had several items that called for unstructured responses. Responses to these items were to be written directly on the schedule. Copies of the interview schedules are included in Appendix A and Appendix B.

In order to compare the progress that is being made in Kentucky in the desegregation of faculties with that of other border states, an inventory sheet was constructed and sent to the states of Delaware, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, and West Virginia. The same information was requested from the District of Columbia. Information was requested pertaining to the number of districts with desegregated faculties and the number of Negro and white teachers involved.

The first two superintendents interviewed volunteered information on techniques that they had used and that they thought were beneficial in making the transition from segregated to desegregated faculties. A specific item designed to secure this information had not been included in the interview schedule. The pertinence of these data led the writer to ask all subsequent administrators interviewed a question designed to determine the techniques that they had used and that they thought facilitated the process of faculty desegregation.

Procedure for Choosing Interviewees

The subjects for this study consist of school superintendents, principals, and teachers. A study of reports of the Kentucky State Department of Education revealed that there were 73 elementary schools, 11 junior high schools, and 25 senior high schools with desegregated faculties in 43 districts in 1963-1964. However, two of these districts no longer had desegregated faculties at the time this investigation was conducted. This change in the number of districts with desegregated faculties reduced the number of elementary schools to 70 and the number of high schools to 24. The sample was based on those districts and schools reporting desegregated faculties in 1963-1964.

All 41 superintendents were to be interviewed, as well as 36 of the 70 elementary principals, 6 junior high school principals, and 12 senior high school principals. Six districts had no elementary schools with desegregated faculties. Thus, one elementary school principal from each district that had an elementary school with a desegregated faculty was selected as a potential respondent. Two elementary principals were selected from each of the two largest school districts. High school principals who were to be interviewed were randomly selected.

The original plan of the investigation called for the sample to include all Negro teachers and an equal number of white teachers. Little time elapsed after the initial interviews were conducted before the investigators realized the impossibility of conducting the proposed number of interviews unless much more time than had originally been scheduled was allotted. The interviews were conducted during the early part of the 1964-1965 school year. At this time, many teachers were extremely busy which made it difficult to schedule appointments for interviews. This was not due mainly to reluctance on the part of the respondents, but to the difficulty of arranging a suitable time for the interviews. Many of the teachers involved belonged to organizations and associations that were most active in the fall. Interviews had to be scheduled around their commitments to other activities.

Some teachers were interviewed from 38 of the 41 districts with desegregated faculties in 1963-1964. Interviews were held with 315 teachers. The number of interviews conducted are ample enough to justify the belief that additional responses would not alter the findings and conclusions of the study.

Procedure for Collecting Data

The primary data for this study were collected from school districts in Kentucky that have desegregated faculties. Once the number and location of districts were ascertained it was necessary to secure the names and addresses of superintendents and principals who were to be interviewed. This information was secured from a directory published by the Kentucky State Department of Education. The state was divided into six areas for the purpose of conducting interviews. A time schedule was established for visiting each of these areas. The amount of time allotted for each area was based on the number of interviews to be conducted, the number of districts in the area, and the distance between districts. Letters were then sent to superintendents in the first area in which interviews were to be conducted asking if they would be willing to supply information for the study. Permission was also requested to interview principals in the school district. A self-addressed card was enclosed in each letter to facilitate replies. Some superintendents felt that the approval of the Kentucky State Department of Education was necessary before they could consent to supply information. Mr. Sam Taylor, Assistant Director of the Division of Instructional Services, kindly consented to write a letter to the superintendents of the districts concerned stating that the study met the approval of the State Department of Education.

When most of the interviewing had been completed in the first area, letters were sent to superintendents in the second area. This procedure was followed until all six areas had been covered. The time schedule that was prepared had to be abandoned. Many superintendents had scheduled conferences and meetings which made it impossible for them to be interviewed within the range of time proposed in the letters. On three different occasions the writer had to return to areas in which most of the interviewing had been completed in order to interview one or two persons who were unavailable when he was first in the district.

Interviews were conducted from the second week in October, 1964, through the first week in January, 1965. Interviews were held with superintendents and principals in their offices. The semi-structured interview schedules made it possible to talk with administrators in a conversational manner and at the same time record their responses to questions. However, there were many occasions when the categories of answers structured did not correspond with the information supplied by the interviewee; thus, it was necessary to do much writing. Interviews were held with teachers in many places, mostly homes. There was an attempt to conduct interviews in a permissive and congenial atmosphere where teachers would not feel pressured in any way.

The writer was treated most cordially by superintendents and principals. Many times the school leaders insisted that he stay for lunch when the schedule called for travel to begin to the next appointment. Dr. Morris Cierley, who assisted with the interviewing, reported similar treatment. The teachers who were interviewed were extremely cooperative. There was only one case of a teacher refusing to talk with the writer. This teacher would not permit an explanation of the purpose of the visit. Her reluctance was not due to the nature of the study but to personal reasons. On several occasions the writer was mistaken for a traveling salesman, a lawyer, and a Civil Rights worker. In most instances, when the credentials from the University of Kentucky were shown and the purpose of the investigation was explained, there was an eagerness to respond by those teachers who were initially reluctant to do so.

Many teachers were very helpful in setting up appointments with other teachers. They would call other teachers, explain the purpose of the visit, and make arrangements for interviews with those teachers. This assistance was most helpful and highly appreciated.

Validation of Data

Most of the data gathered for this study is of a subjective nature. Since the experiences of teachers and administrators may be influenced by many extraneous factors the possible unreliability of these types of data becomes apparent. For this type of study, however, the experiences reported are pertinent to the aims and objectives of this investigation.

The realization that variations in responses are often due to the manner in which a question is asked led the writer to be particularly careful in framing questions for each respondent. Whenever it was necessary to explain a question, the explanation given to other respondents was used insofar as this was possible.

Every attempt has been made to be as objective as possible in the collection and analysis of these data. The statistical computations that have been performed have been gone over thoroughly in order to eliminate all errors.

Since no pressure of any kind was used to gather information for this study, and all respondents answered questions frankly and seemingly to the best of their knowledge, it is reasonable to assume that the findings and conclusions of this study are valid.

Procedure in the Treatment of Data

The nature of this study does not demand elaborate statistical treatment. Therefore, only elementary statistical methods are used in the treatment of the data gathered for this research. Whenever possible, tabular methods are used to describe various aspects of the factors being studied.

Comparisons are made either by tables or by descriptive methods. The primary data that were objective in nature have been treated with statistics that show central tendencies. Another reason for the use of elementary statistical methods is that the writer is attempting to write in a form so that laymen, such as school board members, will be able to read this report with comprehension and understanding.

Much of the tabulating of the data was performed by the Computing Center of the University of Kentucky. Some of the data are treated in narrative form. The data have been categorized in several different ways. The school districts that had desegregated faculties have been arbitrarily divided into large and small districts. Those districts with 5,000 or more students have been classified as large districts. Those districts with under 5,000 students have been classified as small districts. School districts have also been classified according to whether they are county districts or independent districts. The purpose of these classifications is to determine if there are differences in factors related to faculty desegregation that are associated with size and type of district.

This investigation is reported in seven chapters. Chapter I introduces the problem. In Chapter II the historical background of segregation and the transition to desegregation are analyzed. Chapter III deals with a review of literature related to faculty desegregation. Chapter IV describes the background and developments in faculty desegregation in Kentucky. An analysis of the factors related to faculty desegregation is presented in Chapter V and Chapter VI.

The last chapter summarizes the findings, draws conclusions, and makes recommendations that are based on the findings and conclusions of the study.

CHAPTER II

AN OVERVIEW OF SEGREGATION AND DESEGREGATION IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

To understand more completely the issues and problems involved in desegregation of public schools and faculty desegregation in particular, a basic knowledge of facts and an understanding of how our schools came to be the way they are is needed. There is a long chain of events involving many social and educational changes that pointed to the Supreme Court decision of May, 1954. This decision has undoubtedly spurred faculty desegregation. It is important to understand the attitude of the southern region toward both education and the Negro in order to comprehend the reluctance of many areas to advance toward full equality of educational opportunity and first-class citizenship for Negroes and whites alike.

There is much credence placed in education as an undergirder of democracy. Yet it is in the very field of education that the principles of democracy have been so flagrantly abused. The most glaring example of the denial of democratic principles was in the educational opportunities provided Negroes up until the middle of this century.

Historical evidence points unmistakably to the fact that segregated education prior to the decision of the Supreme Court in 1954 was replete with cases of inequality in education for Negroes. This was, of course, just one other aspect of the generalized prejudice and discrimination that existed against Negroes.

Segregation in Public Education Prior to 1954

The maintenance of separate schools for Negroes started after the Civil War. The constitutions of the southern states that were adopted during Reconstruction contained many admirable provisions for the establishment of systems of free public education that were equal for the races.[1] Negro education was watched over by the Freedmen's Bureau, a powerful federal agency that influenced many other aspects of Negro life during Reconstruction.

Reconstruction, with its soaring opportunities for Negroes and mental agony for southern whites, ended in 1877, as the last of the federal troops were withdrawn. In the years that followed the Negro was disenfranchised, removed from office, and stripped completely of his power. There was no way by which he could bring pressure to bear on those in power to provide public education for Negroes—equal or unequal. Logan states of this period that, "the restoration of white supremacy in the South was well nigh complete. Pragmatically the federal government had failed in its experiment to give Southern Negroes the political power to participate effectively in shaping their own destiny."[2]

The truth is, though, the South provided little in the way of public education for whites in the decades after Reconstruction. It was an agricultural province that had suffered the ravages of war. Poverty was almost universal. There was no economic base on which an adequate system of public schools could be built.[3] It is not difficult to understand how, faced with the choice of providing the barest rudiments of education for both races and providing slightly better educational opportunities for whites at the expense of Negro education, the latter would be unhesitatingly chosen.

---

[1] Rayford Logan, The Negro in the United States—A Brief History (Washington: Van Nostrand, 1957), p. 31.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

[3] Truman Pierce, *et al.*, White and Negro Schools in the South (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1955), p. 39.

This pattern was to persist for many years to come. It seemed that the North felt that it had done its duty in freeing Negroes from slavery and setting up an artificial desegregated government. President Hayes declared publicly that he had adopted a hands-off policy and would leave "the protection of Negroes' constitutional rights to those white men of intelligence."[4]

There is hardly a doubt that Negroes desired schooling. They were probably more interested in equal educational opportunity than in pressing for desegregated schools. There is also no doubt that the whites had no idea of providing opportunities for their so recent servants that would tend to give them equal social standing. Horace Mann Bond sums up this attitude:

> Those who argued against mixed schools were right in believing that such a system was impossible in the South, but they were wrong in believing that the South could, or would, maintain equal schools for both races. Those who argued for mixed schools were right in believing that separate schools meant discrimination against Negroes, but they were opposed to the logic of history and the reality of human nature and racial prejudice.[5]

The circumstances cited led to Negro education in the South during the latter part of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century being regarded as more of a function of the federal government and private philanthropies than of local government. Had it not been for support supplied by the Peabody Fund, the Slater Fund, the Jeanes Fund, and the Rosenwald Fund there is little doubt that Negro education would have become almost non-existent.

---

[4] Logan, op. cit., p. 40.

[5] Horace Mann Bond, The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1934), p. 57.

The first challenge to bi-racial schools came, not in the South, but in the North. In 1849, Charles Sumner, who was later to become the most militant crusader for Negro rights during the Civil War and Reconstruction, appeared before the Supreme Court of Massachusetts on behalf of a Negro girl who had been denied the right to attend a white school much closer to her home. Sumner argued before the court that the bill of rights in the Massachusetts Constitution ruled out legal distinctions based on race by proclaiming that all citizens were born equal. He also argued that segregated schools tended to perpetuate the odious distinctions of caste founded in a deep-rooted prejudice in public opinion. A parting shot by Sumner was that the schools of Boston which were separate by ordinance were not in fact equal.

The Supreme Court of Massachusetts ruled against Sumner and his client in a language that was to be heard for many years. The court ruled that racial segregation in itself did not constitute discrimination, and that in the provision of substantially equal schools for Negroes the Boston School Committee had exercised local powers not specifically denied it by higher authority.[6]

Ashmore, in his penetrating work, The Negro and the Schools, observes that, though the statute was set aside in Massachusetts in 1855, the legal doctrine enunciated by the court decision of 1849 furnished a pattern-setting precedent for courts of the non-South. He comments: "State enforced segregation was successively upheld in Ohio, Indiana, California, New York, West Virginia, and Missouri. The Fourteenth Amendment was disposed of by the same line of reasoning applied to the Massachusetts bill of rights in the Roberts case."[7]

---

[6] Pierce, op. cit., p. 35.

[7] Harry Ashmore, The Negro and the Schools (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954), p. 12.

The above description of segregated schools characterized public education in the South until the late 1940's. The separateness was undoubtedly reinforced by the decision of the Supreme Court in 1896 in the famous Plessy v. Ferguson case. Plessy, a man of one-eighth Negro descent was seeking to invalidate a Louisiana law requiring the separation of the races on trains. He held that the law violated his rights under the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments. The Supreme Court ruled, not only that states could pass and execute laws requiring separation of the races, but pointed to the establishment of separate schools for Negro and white children as an example of the power of state legislative bodies to require separation of the races. The Court decision stated:

> Laws permitting, and even requiring separation of the races in places where they are liable to be brought into contact do not necessarily imply the inferiority of either race to the other, and have been generally, if not universally, recognized as within the competency of state legislatures in the exercise of their police powers. The most common instance of this is connected with the establishment of separate schools for white and colored children, which has been held a valid exercise of the legislative power even by courts of states where the political rights of the colored race have been longest and most earnestly enforced.[8]

Thus, segregated schools for the races was given even greater strength by this ruling of the Court, for the Court apparently veered off its course to recognize that segregation in education was not limited to the South but was a general American practice. Ashmore comments:

> Thus the "separate but equal" doctrine was given the sanction of federal law by virtue of a dictum, or side remark of the Court. Actually the circumstance may have given the precedent even greater strength, for here the Court went out of the way to recognize that segregation in education was a general American

---

[8] Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 (U. S.) 537 (1896).

> practice, not a uniquely Southern one. In any event, the Court had firmly imbedded the durable doctrine which has been the determinant in all subsequent litigation involving the dual school system.[9]

This sanction of the "separate but equal" doctrine in the education of Negro and white youth served to firmly entrench the doctrine, at least at the elementary and secondary levels, for more than a half century. During this span of time the "separate" part was taken literally but the "equal" was not even approached in most school districts.

To understand why the Negro schools were so neglected it is necessary to understand the mind of the South during this time. During the 1890's the South was overcoming the ravages of the Reconstruction era. Hatred for Northerners and Negroes engendered during Reconstruction that had long smouldered could now burst into flame. The northern whites had returned home, their mission accomplished. It was left for the Negro to bear the brunt of the hostilities created by the War and Reconstruction.

Though Negroes had been emancipated they were accorded a status just a little higher than that they formerly occupied. Negroes were still thought of as "hewers of wood and drawers of water." The land owners and employers of Negroes had little use for Negro literacy. The poorer whites feared the power Negroes might gain from literacy. Those whites who yielded to the idea that Negroes might need some education thought that it should have been limited to a vocational nature.

Educational leaders of the Negro race did not challenge the attitude of Southerners toward separate Negro education. Booker T. Washington, in his Atlanta Exposition speech of 1895, expressed succinctly the idea that Negroes and whites could get along separately, as fingers on the same hand. The philosophy of Washington has been criticized by DuBois and others as being paternalistic and accommodating. However, Washington was able to accomplish through a realistic approach to race relations what had been lacking for several decades. He was able to communicate with members of the white race and have them understand that the condition of the Negro would have to improve along with that of the white race if the South was to become a productive thriving region.

---

[9] Ashmore, op. cit., p. 12.

Louis R. Harlan, in discussing Washington's approach to Negro-white relations, says, "he established rapport with the dwindling group of upper-class southerners of paternalistic humor. . . . The Negro Moses was significantly an educator taking the long road through the wilderness of Southern race relations."[10]

Though Washington's approach to race relations may be considered conciliatory, he still made it possible for many Negroes to receive an industrial and technical training that otherwise would not have been possible.

To deny that there were gains made in both Negro and white education during the period from 1870 to 1950 would be to deny the truth. Both were making gains but the white schools steadily outstripped those for Negroes. There is no doubt that much discrimination existed. In 1940, the Southern region was spending only 43 per cent as much per Negro student as it was spending per white student. By 1952 this figure had risen to 75 per cent.[11]

Segregation and Desegregation Following the Supreme Court Decision of 1954

Though desegregation in public education in the Southern region did not end until 1954, the death knell had been sounded by court opinions in several cases involving higher education prior to that year. In the cases of Missouri ex. rel. Gaines v. Canada, Sipuel v. Oklahoma, Sweatt v. Painter, and McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Board of Regents the Supreme Court ruled that Negroes were to be admitted to graduate schools since no Negro schools were equal in tangible and intangible factors. Relief to the plaintiffs in each case was granted on the basis that no "equal" facilities existed rather than on an examination of the doctrine expressed in Plessy v. Ferguson.[12]

---

[10] Louis R. Harlan, Separate and Unequal (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958), p. 37.

[11] Pierce, op. cit., p. 178.

Public education that had operated under the principle of separate schools for Negroes and whites for over fifty years legally came to an end on May 17, 1954. Before this time the Fourteenth Amendment had been interpreted to mean that the several states could operate separate schools. The new interpretation was that segregation deprives Negro pupils of the equal protection of the laws.

The decision of the Court was based on evidence presented by social scientists that segregation has a detrimental effect on Negro children. The Court stated in its decision:

> We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment.[13]

It is believed that the Court took the changed status of the Negro into consideration in outlawing compulsory segregation in the schools. Foremost among the factors bringing about a change in the status of the Negro was the emergence of a demanding Negro leadership. Composed largely of intellectuals and professional men, this group did not accept the idea of limited opportunity for the Negro but demanded recognition of the Negro's right to first-class citizenship. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, founded in 1909, was carrying forth a vigorous protest. The National Urban League, founded in 1911, was active in seeking equality of employment opportunities, as well as equal treatment of Negroes in other areas. W. E. B. DuBois, Carter Woodson, and Charles Johnson were continually assaulting prejudice and discrimination through their publications.[14] These activities led to the breaking of many racial barriers. Professional organizations, especially teachers associations, began to merge with Negro branches. Negroes were employed in professions, industry, and business to a limited extent. The policy of total exclusion and pay differentials based on race had grudgingly given way to one that recognized that the quality of work and ability of the individual should be the standard of judgment.

---

[12] Hubert H. Humphrey (Ed.), Integration vs. Segregation (New York: T. Y. Crowell Company, 1963), p. 26.

[13] Quoted in Humphrey, Ibid., p. 28, from Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka decision.

The reaction of the Southern and border states to the desegregation decision can be grouped into three categories: (a) those that immediately desegregated, (b) those that adopted a "wait and see" or "proceed cautiously" attitude, and (c) those that began preparations to resist and evade the intent of the ruling of the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court decision was triggered by five cases. Three of the cases originated in the states of Delaware, Kansas, and the District of Columbia. The school districts in these areas complied with the Court's ruling without delaying. This was not true of the two cases involving the Southern states of Virginia and South Carolina. Public officials in Prince Edward County, Virginia, used every available means to prevent desegregation of the schools, even closing the public schools. Clarendon County, South Carolina, continues to operate segregated public schools. Between these two extremes of compliance and defiance was a middle road that was walked by many school officials. These officials developed plans for admitting a token number of Negroes to formerly all-white schools as a show of good faith.

---

[14] Arnold Rose, The Negro in America (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944), pp. 263-269.

By 1955, the District of Columbia and the border states of Delaware, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, and West Virginia had started desegregating the schools. The Southern states started the change more slowly. Arkansas, Tennessee, and Texas were the first Southern states to begin desegregation. These states started in 1955. Starting in the 1956-57 school year, one state per year began school desegregation in the following order: North Carolina, Virginia, Florida, Louisiana, and Georgia. Alabama and South Carolina did not act until 1963-64. Mississippi began desegregation of the public schools in the fall of the 1964-65 school year.[15]

At the end of the 1963-64 school year it was estimated that 9.3 per cent of the total Negro enrollment was attending desegregated schools in the border and Southern states. About 19 per cent of all the districts in the region and 38 per cent of those with bi-racial enrollments had begun desegregation of students by the end of the 1963-64 school year.[16]

This brief glimpse of the extent of student desegregation creates the impression that all has gone extremely well in these latter years. It is necessary to look beneath the magic of numbers and names in order to understand some of the problems and issues involved in desegregation.

Patterns of Reaction to the Decision of 1954

The Supreme Court decision gave no indication of how desegregation was to be accomplished. It remanded the cases back to the lower courts in the implementation decision of 1955. State school officials were given the responsibility of solving the problem. The court was mindful to point out that authorities were to act in good faith in making a prompt and reasonable start, and that Negroes should be admitted to schools on a non-discriminatory basis "with all deliberate speed." This leniency, as it was looked on by many, gave cognizance to the fact that the Southern region was composed of people of many different backgrounds, attitudes, and social customs. Even within a state there are varying degrees of resistance to social change. These very broad general directions for accomplishing desegregation of public schools allowed those officials truly interested in moving to desegregate to try plans that they felt would be more suitable for their communities. The result was that many different approaches have been used by various districts in initiating desegregation in the schools.

---

[15] Jim Leeson, "The First Ten Years," Phi Delta Kappan, XLV (May, 1964), pp. 262-63.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 264.

The border states of Kentucky, Maryland, Delaware, Missouri, Oklahoma, and West Virginia immediately accepted the decision of the Supreme Court and began making plans to desegregate the public schools. The public and official attitude was to comply with the decision on a large scale. However, there are pockets of resentment and resistance in each of these states which have kept desegregation to a minimum in many districts. It must be noted that the attitude taken by public officials was responsible in many cases for desegregation moving as smoothly as it did in the border states. Most officials looked upon the decision of 1954 as being the law of the land, and that it must be obeyed. The statement of State School Superintendent W. W. Trent of West Virginia is exemplary of this attitude: "I am glad the Supreme Court upheld my opinion. Last June I advised county superintendents to desegregate as rapidly as the number of school buildings and teachers permitted."[17]

School administrators and public officials in most of the border states spoke out in favor of school desegregation. It is the opinion of many officials that this positive and forthright attitude was in large part responsible for the ease in transition in many districts. Despite the dire predictions of violence and bloodshed that preceded the desegregation of many districts there was a notable lack of disorderliness of this type. Where public and educational leaders stepped in and emphatically stated that school desegregation would take place, much of the violence that did exist melted away.[18]

---

[17] Southern School News (June 8, 1955), p. 7.

Though the border states moved quite rapidly in comparison to the Southern states, few of the plans called for faculty desegregation. The Supreme Court left the question of faculty desegregation unsettled. There was no mention of whether faculty desegregation was considered a part of the school desegregation process or whether the decision related to students only. Some school officials interpreted the decision to include teachers; others thought that it applied only to students. At the outset of desegregation only Missouri, Delaware, and Maryland moved to desegregate some faculties. This reluctance to place Negro teachers in white faculties partially resulted from the attitude held by many school men that Negro teachers, taken as a group, are not as competent as white teachers. It was felt that Negroes come up through segregated inferior educational ladders that leave them less well prepared for the training of youth. Mortimer Morris expresses this attitude cogently: "The Negro teacher's intellectual competence is questioned. He can get the same degree from the same institution as whites, but in the push toward integration he is referred to as an inferior teacher."[19]

The attitude of the populace of the border states toward student desegregation could be expected to be different from that of the South. The areas north of these states were making an honest effort to desegregate schools.

---

[18] Herbert Wey and John Corey, Action Patterns in School Desegregation (Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa, 1958), pp. 159-161.

[19] Mortimer Morris, "Let's Integrate Our Teachers Too," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXIX (June, 1958), p. 405.

No doubt some of the thinking, planning, and activity related to desegregation filtered through to the border areas. Many districts were considering desegregation because of the added expense of operating separate schools for Negroes. Desegregation of other community agencies was also steadily chipping away at the wall of separation between the two races. Corey and Wey have observed that "every segregated hotel, eating establishment, theater, golf course, swimming pool, church, auditorium, or any other public place opening its doors to Negroes moves a community one step closer to an easier and more constructive school desegregation."[20]

The attitude of the majority of the people in the South toward Negroes precluded a change in social customs that would facilitate the desegregation of the schools. Thus, the Southern states chose not to follow the patterns of compliance laid down by the border area. They devised plans for resisting and evading the intent of the decision of the Supreme Court. The most popular plan was the passage of pupil placement laws. After sanction by the courts all eleven Southern states, including Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia, adopted some form of pupil placement law. Compulsory attendance laws were either amended or repealed. Many states adopted freedom-of-choice provisions that would prevent children of different races being forced to attend school together. Tied in with this plan was one that provided tuition grants to children who chose to attend private schools rather than desegregated public ones.[21]

Tennessee was the only Southern state that did not adopt laws to permit the closing of public schools, though few states used these laws. Additional laws were designed to hamper the activities of the National Association for the

---

[20] Corey and Wey, op. cit., p. 17.

[21] Don Shoemaker, With All Deliberate Speed (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 225.

Advancement of Colored People, such as requiring the revelation of membership lists and threatening to fire any employee found to be a member of the organization. In addition to the devices already enumerated, each Southern state had a committee to propose defenses against desegregation. Over 100 Southern congressmen signed the "Southern Manifesto" in 1956 stating that the Supreme Court decision was an abuse of judicial power. Shoemaker lists twenty-three major types of legislation adopted in eleven Southern states that were designed to prevent or control desegregation.[22]

Another reaction of the Southern states to the Supreme Court decision that was most apparent was the tremendous surge in the provision of public education facilities for Negroes. New school buildings were provided, more textbooks were allotted, and the pupil-teacher ratio was lowered. It appears that increased effort to strengthen Negro education was due in part to the belief that "equal" Negro facilities would forestall implementation of the desegregation order. Southerners reasoned that if educational facilities did not exist that could be pointed to as equal, then court decisions would be more likely to order desegregation.

From 1951 to 1956, South Carolina spent or approved for school construction 174.6 million dollars—51.4 per cent of this for Negro schools. Seventy-five per cent of the first expenditures under this program were spent for Negro school projects.[23] Mississippi and other states moved forward with school equalization programs. The 1955 Mississippi legislature is reported to have authorized 120 million dollars for school equalization programs over a period of years. More than 13 million dollars worth of school construction had been authorized by April 1957. Eighty per cent of this amount was to go toward construction of buildings for Negroes.

---

[22] Ibid.

[23] Ibid.

An added stimulus to this effort to upgrade Negro education was the threat of court action by Negroes who were dissatisfied with existing segregated conditions. Public school leaders undoubtedly felt that new schools, more books, better trained teachers, and other improved conditions would eliminate the insistent demands for desegregated schools. Such did not prove to be the case.

At present, the issue is not whether desegregation is to continue but at what rate, in what manner, and in what ways so that quality education can be preserved. Administrators of public education who realized the inevitability of mixed schools have been concerned from the beginning about the best method of effecting desegregation of the schools. The border states formed state commissions on human rights and advisory groups to assist in determining the best method of desegregating the schools.[24]

Many school and community leaders hold varying ideas regarding the level at which their communities would best accept—or least resist desegregation. As a result of these beliefs desegregation methods have followed two general courses. One formula calls for desegregation of all schools and all grades in a district at the same time. Corey and Wey report that this plan has been found to be as effective in one size and kind of district as in districts of another size and kind. They conclude that this plan is most desirable when it can be demonstrated that the per-pupil cost of maintaining separate equal facilities is high, or where there is a small number of Negro students.[25]

The gradual or "step-at-a-time" approach has been employed in many border state districts, and almost exclusively in the Southern states. Many officials, taking into consideration the attitude of their communities, expressed the opinion that it would be better to desegregate the elementary schools first, then the high schools. Other districts started desegregation at the top grade and moved downward a grade or more per year. Most of the grade-a-year plans have been stricken down by the courts as not complying with the "with all deliberate speed" portion of the Supreme Court decision.

---

[24] Ibid.

[25] Corey and Wey, op. cit., p. 89.

All school officials have reasons for starting desegregation at the level that they have chosen. Many feel that there is less community resistance to desegregation in the upper grades. Others feel that there is less prejudice among children at the primary level. Regarding the plan for desegregation, Corey and Wey reach this conclusion:

> In analyzing different plans it becomes apparent that there is no one answer. Each community must develop its plan in the light of community conditions and objectives to be accomplished. Even more important in accomplishing certain objectives are the policies and decisions that accompany a plan.[26]

Desegregation at the Administrative and Professional Organization Levels

Desegregation has extended into the administrative and policy-making level in a few locations. For many years becoming a principal was the highest realistic aspiration of the Negro in school administration. (Some areas did have supervisors that were provided by the Jeanes Fund. These, of course, were called "Jeanes Teachers.") The Negro had no power at the policy-making level. There was no one to represent his cause at this level for many years. This trend has been reversed somewhat in the last one and a half decades Negroes have served on local boards of education in seven Southern states. Kentucky and North Carolina have each had a Negro on the state board of education. Negroes have recently been placed in higher administrative positions in local and state departments of education. A Negro principal was made coordinator of General Education in Chattanooga, Tennessee in 1964.[27]

---

[26] Ibid., p. 127.

[27] The Chattanooga Times (Thursday, July 9, 1964), p. 11.

These currents of change indicate that there is a trend toward the realization that Negroes are capable of contributing to education in capacities other than as teachers and principals of predominantly Negro schools.

Professional organizations have not taken an active role in pushing desegregation of students or faculties, but they have made significant steps toward the desegregation of their own bodies. The National Education Association desegregated its state and local branches in the mid-1950's. The Southern states have not moved in this direction due to opposition from both Negro and white associations. Leaders of the segregated Negro organizations have observed that where Negro organizations have merged with white organizations, Negroes have lost their identity. To support their case they point to the lack of Negro directors of the NEA from states that have merged their branches. There are few Negro delegates to the NEA conventions from the states that do not have what is called "affiliate organizations."

The NEA hesitated for several years before it produced a statement supporting the Supreme Court decision. In 1963 a resolution was passed by the Representative assembly that requested the Association to plan and initiate actions which would support school officials and teachers involved in desegregation. A portion of the statement directed the Association to work to:

> Alleviate anxieties among teachers and officials who administer the public schools.
>
> Support local and state officials which seek to protect teachers whenever their professional rights and status are unfairly menaced.
>
> Openly commend, for efforts to improve conditions, local and state officials of public school systems, directors and officers of local and state organizations, teachers and administrators of public schools, and private citizens.[28]

---

[28] National Education Association, NEA Handbook, 1963-64 (Washington: National Education Association, 1963), p. 62.

The impression is not meant to be conveyed that professional organizations are doing nothing to promote equality of educational opportunity. Both the American Federation of Teachers and the NEA were instrumental in promoting legislation that brought the return of public education to Prince Edward County, Virginia. These organizations also helped finance teachers for the Prince Edward County Free School Association. But there is evidence still of the truth of an editorial statement which said, "As organized groups, however, teachers have probably suffered from over-caution and lack of imagination. Teachers organizations, or course, are afraid to lead, they wait to be pushed."[29]

Effects of School Desegregation on Teachers

Teachers, along with school administrators, have been caught in the crossfire of the opposing forces in the desegregation of schools. Those states that offered determined resistance to desegregation adopted practices that left many teachers apprehensive and concerned. Teachers have been required to list organizations to which they belonged or contributed. Many of these same states have revised the teacher tenure laws so that teachers may be dismissed more easily. Laws have been passed that require the removal of teachers promoting desegregation. There have been threats of dismissal of Negro teachers, and actual dismissals in many cases. Those states that promoted the idea of establishing private schools provided some protection for teachers' pensions and retirement contributions if they were employed in private schools. Most of the procedures listed were bound to plans by states to resist or delay the mandates of the Supreme Court decision of 1954.

Glen Robinson, in analyzing the results of the court decision in 1957, cites the case of two teachers being dismissed for not voting for a 1954 resolution favoring segregation. Robinson also reports that a seventh grade white teacher and a Negro principal were forced to resign. The seventh grade teacher's difficulty arose because he asked the question "if the students' attitude at Alabama was Christian or American." Negro parents forced the resignation of a Florida Negro principal because of statements made by him advocating that they forget integration.[30]

---

[29] Phi Delta Kappan, XLV (May, 1964), p. 361.

Desegregation of students has led to dismissal of Negro teachers and threats of dismissal in those states where only token desegregation exists.

A superintendent from a Southern state, on being questioned on the fate of Negro teachers, replied that the attitude of the people dictated that it would be the "Negro teacher who would suffer."[31] Evidence reveals that it has been the Negro teacher who has suffered loss of jobs in states where desegregation has taken place to a considerable extent. There have been approximately 390 Negro teachers dismissed in Oklahoma.[32] A survey made in 1955 revealed the following number of Negro teachers dismissed: 60 in Kentucky, 58 in West Virginia, 20 in Missouri, and 20 in Texas.[33] Those teachers dismissed in Kentucky, Missouri, and Texas were re-employed—usually in the same state. The dismissal of Negro teachers largely resulted from the closing of one- and two-teacher Negro schools. The students from these schools were transferred to formerly all-white schools resulting in the dismissal of Negro teachers.

An article prepared by Lawrence V. Jordan[34] reviewed what happened to Negro teachers in the process of desegregation in West Virginia one year following the Supreme Court decision. His findings led him to conclude that the employment status of Negro teachers was uncertain:

---

[30] Glen Robinson, "Caught in the Crossfire," The Nation's Schools, LIX (January, 1959), p. 68.

[31] Hurley H. Doddy and G. G. Edwards, "Apprehensions of Negro Teachers Concerning Desegregation in South Carolina," Journal of Negro Education, XXIV (Winter, 1955), p. 529.

[32] Southern School News, June, 1963, p. 16.

[33] Ibid., October, 1955, p. 5.

[34] Lawrence V. Jordan, "Educational Integration in West Virginia One Year Afterwards," Journal of Negro Education, XXIV (Summer, 1955), pp.276-79.

> If the present rate of reduction of Negro employees were to become the pattern for the state, one half of West Virginia's 973 Negro teachers, though somewhat better prepared academically than their white colleagues, would be discharged in the face of what the West Virginia Education Association has called a serious teacher shortage.[35]

Desegregation of students has led also to Negro and white teachers working together on the same faculty. In September 1954, few school districts in the Southern region had desegregated faculties. Doddy surveyed the extent of faculty desegregation in the Southern region in 1955. He found that four states—Missouri, Maryland, Delaware, and West Virginia—along with the District of Columbia, had desegregated faculties in a few districts. The District of Columbia was reported to have mixed faculties in about one fifth of its schools. Eighty-six Negro teachers were employed in these faculties. A few teachers were employed in formerly white faculties in St. Louis and Baltimore by 1955.[36]

In 1957, several districts in West Virginia had desegregated faculties. There were desegregated faculties in Wilmington, Delaware, in 1958. Kentucky had several districts with desegregated faculties in 1958. Kentucky reversed the trend in that desegregation of faculties of small districts began before the desegregation of faculties in the large districts. Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas also had single cases of desegregated faculties in 1958.

A recent survey by Wey shows that only in the large communities, such as St. Louis, Louisville, Baltimore, and Washington, has faculty desegregation increased to an appreciable extent.[37] St. Louis has desegregated faculties in most elementary schools, all high schools, and in the teachers college. One third of all teachers in Baltimore serve on biracial staffs.

---

[35] Ibid.

[36] Hurley H. Doddy, "Desegregation and the Employment of Negro Teachers," Journal of Negro Education, XXIV (Fall, 1955), pp. 405-408.

Faculty desegregation, other than on a token basis, has been limited to large cities with heavy concentrations of Negroes. It appears that continued integration and desegregation of faculties in these areas is quite certain. In many of the smaller districts faculty desegregation will depend on the tenure status of teachers.

In the ten-year interval since the Supreme Court decision on school desegregation of all the border states, the District of Columbia, and four of the Southern states have initiated faculty desegregation. The states included are Delaware, Florida, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia. Segregation of teachers and administrative personnel still exists in seven states—Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

Legal Aspects of Faculty Desegregation

The drive to initiate faculty desegregation in the Southern and border states has resulted in several suits being filed in federal courts. In January, 1964, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the decision of a United States District Judge which ordered Duval County, Florida, to desegregate its teachers and staff. In the first half of 1963, two United States District Court judges in Kentucky ordered faculty desegregation to begin in four districts. A Federal District Court judge also ordered the Oklahoma City Board of Education to begin bi-racial faculty assignments.[38]

---

[37] Herbert W. Wey, "Desegregation—It Works," Phi Delta Kappan, XLV (May, 1964), p. 382.

[38] Southern School News (February 1964), pp. 1, 16, and (July 1964), p. 3.

Two other rulings on faculty desegregation have been handed down by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. A decision of a United States District Court judge that assignment of teachers by race was not a violation of constitutional rights led him to strike out a portion of a suit petitioning for teacher desegregation in Escambia County, Florida. The Court of Appeals overturned the ruling and ordered the district court to consider on its merits the request for teacher desegregation.

The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals refused to order Atlanta to consider the immediate desegregation of faculties. The Supreme Court agreed to hear the case from Atlanta. In May, 1964, the Supreme Court ordered a new hearing without saying specifically whether Atlanta's faculties had to be desegregated.

The legal arguments on the issue of faculty desegregation involve questions concerning the original and subsequent rulings of the Supreme Court regarding desegregation, namely:

> Do these decisions authorize the lower courts to become concerned with faculty desegregation?
>
> Are Negro children educationally and psychologically injured by the assignment of teachers and school personnel on the basis of race, thus bringing this issue under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment?

It appears that most judges have interpreted the decisions in a manner similar to that of Judge Simpson (Braxton v. Duval County, Florida) who wrote:

> There may be no determinations based upon race or color, in whole or part, with respect to the operation of the public school system, or any of its components. The Brown case is misread and misapplied when it is construed simply to confer upon Negro pupils the right to be considered for admission to a white school.[39]

---

[39] Quoted in Southern School News (February, 1964), p. 16.

However, there is still some uncertainty regarding the legal status of faculty desegregation as was evidenced by the dissenting opinion of Circuit Court Judge Jones in the Duval County ruling. He held that "Brown dealt with pupil segregation, not with the assignment of school personnel."

The opinion handed down in the Oklahoma City case followed the reasoning of Judge Simpson:

> Inasmuch as the superintendent has the established proof necessary that Negro teachers are equal in quality to white teachers, it seems only reasonable and fair that in all schools, mixed or otherwise, the school board would and should make a good faith effort to integrate the faculty, in order that both white and Negro students would feel their color was represented on an equal level and that their people were sharing the responsibility of high-level teaching.[40]

The decisions rendered in the majority of the suits seeking desegregation of faculties will have far-reaching effects. Many educators feel that these decisions will serve as a catalyst for faculty desegregation. The cases reported and others point to the need for careful planning and preparation in moving to desegregate the schools.

Chapter Summary

Negro public education from its inception following the Civil war was completely separated from that for whites. Negro teachers were employed for Negro schools and white teachers for white schools. There was little attempt to provide anything but the barest minimum essentials for Negro schools. Philanthropic foundations made it possible for Negro education to survive during the latter part of the nineteenth century.

The decisions rendered by the courts prior to 1900 regarding separate and mixed schools all served to reinforce the attitude of the majority of the people in the Southern region. The changed status of the Negro plus findings by social scientists regarding the damage inflicted by segregated schools on Negro youth produced a reversal in the tone of court decisions leading to the outlawing of segregation in education.

---

[40] Ibid.

Many communities expressed their awareness of the need for a more equitable program of education for all students by immediately placing Negro and white students in classes together. Other communities moved more slowly.

Teacher desegregation followed rather than paralleled student desegregation. Administrators hesitated to desegregate faculties due to beliefs concerning community attitudes and their own convictions. These factors also caused the dismissal of many Negro teachers. On the other hand, many school leaders sought to provide continued employment of Negro teachers.

The large cities in the border states have been more democratic and equalitarian in the continued employment of Negro teachers than other areas have been. However, court decisions have begun to effect an increase in the rate of faculty desegregation in the smaller communities.

America is awakened to the problems inherent in obtaining opportunities for equal education and employment in public schools. There is increasing awareness that the public schools ideally function as preservers and conveyors of the best and most profound ideas from the democratic tradition, both in precept and in practice.

CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RESEARCH RELATED TO FACULTY DESEGREGATION

Most of the literature related to desegregation of faculties has dealt with the employment of Negro teachers and the attitude of teachers serving in desegregated faculties. Few books and articles have dealt with factors influencing the process of faculty desegregation. Though the available research on faculty desegregation is limited there are studies and articles that are pertinent when faculty desegregation is viewed as a concomitant of the larger pattern of change in racial relations. Faculty desegregation calls for re-evaluations and adjustments of modes of behavior and changes in attitudes that are similar in many respects to those required for other forms of desegregation. Methods of interacting and restructuring of relationships are required that are similar to those required in other forms of desegregation. Thus, some of the procedures and findings regarding desegregation of students and other community agencies are instructive for they imply principles of social change that are as valid for faculty desegregation as for other forms of desegregation.

Two general types of literature and research exist that have some bearing on the problem of faculty desegregation. The first of these types treats the total problem of desegregation of public schools with some reference to faculty desegregation. These studies give some attention to processes and procedures involved in faculty desegregation. These reports are pertinent for they reflect principles that have guided school leaders in changing from segregated to desegregated faculties.

General Literature

Williams and Ryan[1] surveyed the experiences of twenty-four communities in states bordering the South that had changed to racially desegregated public schools. This objective well-written statement of actual processes involved in school desegregation gives some attention to faculty desegregation. One of the reports is especially informative for it outlines the procedures followed by one community in moving to desegregate faculties. The authors report that a gradual plan of faculty desegregation was followed in one large urban community. The following procedures were utilized:

1. Negro teachers were appointed to the Upper Grades Study Council.
2. School administrators encouraged teachers to attend interracial workshops that were initiated.
3. The principal talked with white teachers and persuaded them to try working with Negro teachers.
4. Parents were consulted prior to the placement of Negro teachers so that the change could be explained.
5. Faculty desegregation was started in a school where the enrollment was 60 per cent Negro.
6. White teachers disapproving the change could accept assignments in other schools.
7. Principals and Negro teachers were carefully chosen.
8. Talks to students and minimum publicity were utilized to reduce problems.
9. Consultations were held with Negro teachers that were being placed in faculties to be desegregated.

The authors reported several advantages that were stated to have resulted from the change to desegregated faculties. The Negro teachers viewed the change as a relief from anxiety and encouragement to do better work. White teachers accepted the change and many supported and participated in it. Parents accepted the Negro teachers though many were still prejudiced. Parental acceptance was based on the fact that students accepted and liked the Negro teachers. The tension level as shown by fights and name-calling on the playground was reduced significantly.

---

[1] Robin M. Williams and Margaret Ryan, Schools in Transition (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954), pp. 47-57.

The survey revealed that Negro teachers chosen to desegregate faculties were selected on the basis of (1) their grasp of subject matter, (2) ability to teach, and (3) personal neatness.

The authors summarized their findings regarding faculty desegregation in the summary of the report:

> The studies show that in the actual situation of faculty integration, where it has been tried, professional standards soon take precedence over previous racial attitudes. Teacher-to-teacher relations, over a period of time, come to be carried out in the normal professional way according to the usual custom among teachers. Interpersonal relationships develop according to shared interests and personal choice.[2]

Though Williams' and Ryan's book is not concerned with schools in the Southern and border states the findings are still relevant for many communities analyzed in this work have racial customs and traditions that are characteristic of the Southern area. Residential patterns are similar to those of the South in many areas.

Knox[3] made a study of desegregation in the District of Columbia schools. He also gathered opinions from superintendents in nine states with recently desegregated faculties. In order to study developments in the District of Columbia, 500 questionnaires were sent to employees in District of Columbia public schools. The following findings were evidenced by an analysis of the data:

---

[2] Ibid., 245.

[3] Ellis O. Knox, Democracy and the District of Columbia Public Schools (Washington: Judd & Detweiler, Inc., 1957), 131 pp.

1. Eighty-eight per cent of the respondents were members of desegregated faculties.
2. Fifty-four per cent of the responses indicated liberal attitudes toward faculty desegregation.
3. Seventy-seven per cent of the respondents felt that teachers of a different race were well received, even when in a minority, by their co-workers.

Opinions of superintendents were gathered from Arizona, Arkansas, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas, and West Virginia. Their responses to inquiries regarding the capabilities of Negro teachers serving on desegregated faculties seem to reflect the ambivalent opinions that existed during the 1956-1958 period regarding the ability of Negro teachers. Twenty-nine per cent of the superintendents reported that they found Negro teachers to be less efficient than white teachers. Forty-two per cent found Negro teachers to be as efficient as white teachers if they were "comparably qualified." (Quotation marks are those of Knox.) Twenty-nine per cent of the superintendents did not answer the question because of insufficient evidence. Thirty-five per cent of the superintendents stated that their programs of teacher integration functioned successfully. Ten per cent stated that teacher meetings were the only form of teacher integration. Fifty-five per cent of the subjects stated that no teacher desegregation had taken place in their school systems.

A third study that has given generalized attention to faculty desegregation is one prepared as a project of the Phi Delta Kappa Commission by Corey and Wey.[4] This comprehensive study of action patterns followed in the desegregation of schools reports on several school districts that have desegregated faculties. The authors report that the large urban communities that had desegregated faculties to the greatest extent included statements relating to the placement of students and teachers. These statements served to inform all citizens that faculty desegregation was considered to be an integral part of the desegregation process.

---

[4] Herbert Wey and John Corey, Action Patterns in School Desegregation (Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 1958), 276 pp.

Corey and Wey identified factors which their data indicated influenced the desegregation process. These factors were:

1. The availability of classroom space.
2. The amount of residential segregation.
3. The general organizational structure and financial and economic status of the school district.
4. The percentage of Negroes as compared to the total population.
5. The presence of other minority racial or cultural groups.
6. The employment status, including tenure and qualifications, of both white and Negro teachers.
7. Policies relating to desegregation outside the school.
8. Number, type, and general attitude of groups, such as churches, service clubs, and civic organizations.
9. Policies and practices of state agencies concerned with public education.
10. General work of organizations dealing with intergroup relations.
11. Federal and state laws as they relate to desegregation within the community.[5]

Williams and Ryan reached similar conclusions regarding community factors that were of significance in their book which was published four years earlier.[6]

Much of the literature written during the first three years following the Supreme Court decision on school desegregation reported the extent of faculty desegregation in different communities. Hill and Greenberg,[7] Jordan,[8] Doddy,[9] and Coleman[10] gave brief attention to faculty desegregation in their writings.

---

[5] Ibid., p. 137.

[6] Williams and Ryan, op. cit., pp. 239-240.

An intensive study of desegregation of students and faculties in the schools of Evansville, Indiana, was made by Wiley[11] for a doctoral dissertation. He studied the influence of desegregation in other phases of community life and school board and administrative leadership on the plan of desegregation. He also studied schools with desegregated student bodies and faculties to determine their experiences with desegregation. The methods used to gather data were structured interviews, historical research, and questionnaires. Five different population groups served as data sources: members of the board of trustees, school administrators, members of parent-teacher groups, heads of community agencies, and students and teachers of racially desegregated schools. Wiley found that faculty desegregation had been accomplished as a result of the initiative of the superintendent. The superintendent, however, was fully supported in his action by the board of trustees.

Analysis of the data gathered led to the following conclusions regarding faculty desegregation:

---

[7] Herbert Hill and Jack Greenberg, Citizen's Guide to Desegregation (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1955), p. 142.

[8] Lawrence V. Jordan, "Educational Integration in West Virginia One Year Afterwards," Journal of Negro Education, XXIV (Summer, 1955), pp. 276-79.

[9] Hurley H. Doddy, "Desegregation and Employment of Negro Teachers," Journal of Negro Education, XXIV (Fall, 1955), pp. 405-408.

[10] A. Lee Coleman, "Desegregation in the Public Schools of Kentucky—Second Year After the Supreme Court Decision," Journal of Negro Education, XXV (Summer, 1956), pp. 254-26[illegible].

[11] Alfred D. Wiley, "A Study of Desegregation in the Evansville School Corporation, Evansville, Indiana" (Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Indiana University, 1961), 223 pp.

1. Desegregation of faculties is dependent on the caliber of superintendent and assistant superintendent.
2. The construction and use of a fair employment policy is desirable.
3. The absence of a fair employment policy places a strain on the chief school officers who have to bear the brunt of community censure in the case of dissident and opposing individuals.

Conclusions reported by Wiley regarding the community conditions that made for peaceful desegregation of faculty and students were (1) a prior series of interrelated community activities to improve human relations and living conditions, (2) a qualified and respected school board and school leadership, (3) the support of and cooperation of the news media agencies, and (4) the percentage of variety of prior racial contact of whites and Negroes.

Reuter[12] conducted a study for a doctoral dissertation which revealed findings that are significant for faculty desegregation. He studied the way in which thirty techniques were used in the process of public school desegregation. The techniques were used for preparation and implementation. Responses of 146 school administrators served as sources of data. The responses came from administrators in several states. The study covered urban and rural school districts with both large and small Negro populations.

Analysis of the data revealed that the most widely used techniques for preparation were (1) provision of an excellent instructional program, (2) establishing an excellent in-service program, (3) investigation of school desegregation procedures in other schools and school districts, (4) provision of counseling services for all parents, Negro and white, (5) preventing extremely prejudiced persons from disrupting planning sessions, and (6) re-education of a few leaders and key officials rather than the whole community.

---

[12] Frederick W. P. Reuter, "A Study of Thirty Techniques Used and Thirty-two Conditions under which They Were Used to Desegregate Successfully 146 Schools or School Systems in Eleven Southern and Border States" (Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, New York University, 1961), pp. 173-182.

The techniques that were most widely used to implement the decision were (1) rapid implementation as quickly as possible after the policy was accepted by the board of trustees, (2) provision of unwavering unequivocal support to subordinate school officials, (3) stressing educational not social change, and (4) establishing local school autonomy and responsibility as much as possible. The investigator found several significant differences in the use of techniques between rural and urban districts and schools. Urban areas provided more techniques for minority leadership at planning sessions, for establishment of in-service programs for teachers, and for investigation of desegregation procedures in other districts and schools.

Reuter's analysis of the data led him to conclude that the conditions existing that facilitated desegregation were concerned more with values than personal interaction. The conditions found to be most helpful were that many people in the community (1) had a high respect for law and order, (2) had a high respect for religious and moral values, (3) had high respect and esteem for systems of free public education, and (4) had accepted desegregation as inevitable and acquiesced to a changing social pattern.

The contrast in the community conditions judged by Wiley's and Reuter's respondents as being most helpful is obviously noticeable. Wiley's subjects indicated that factors which were sociological in nature were most influential in facilitating the change. Reuter's subjects were of the opinion that the prevailing value patterns were most effective in promoting peaceful desegregation. A possible explanation lies in the different of the two samples. Wiley's sample included several different community groups while Reuter's sample was made up entirely of administrators.

Kenneth Clark,[13] writing much earlier than Wiley or Reuter, identified factors that would have bearing on desegregation. Clark's findings were based on data gathered and used in the brief that was filed with the Supreme Court prior to its decision on desegregation in 1954. By carefully studying and analyzing the data gathered, Clark was able to formulate ten major principles regarding desegregation. In the second principle factors are listed that influence the process of desegregation. Included in this list of factors are (1) population changes, (2) threat of publicity, (3) moral arguments, (4) activity of community action agencies, (5) personal decisions of responsible authorities, (6) legislative and non-legislative governmental action, and (7) threat of court action. The majority of the cases in Clark's study reported that a firm policy to refuse any exceptions to parents accounted for a smooth and effective transition.

---

[13] Kenneth Clark, "Desegregation: An Appraisal of the Evidence," Journal of Social Issues, IX, No. 4 (1953), pp. 1-79.

Literature Directly Related to Faculty Desegregation

The studies that are directly related to faculty desegregation can be divided into two classes. Studies that treat the attitudes and behavior of individuals involved in the faculty desegregation process form one of these classes and studies dealing with the experiences of persons serving in desegregated faculties form another class.

Dwyer[14] investigated the attitudes of administrators, teachers, and students toward faculty desegregation. This study was based on data gathered from seven school districts in central Missouri ranging in size from 3,000 to 30,000 inhabitants. The sample included administrators, Negro and white teachers, and Negro and white students. The findings of this investigation were:

1. Administrators were reluctant to consider the assignment of Negro teachers to white staffs though they recognized that the Negro teachers were qualified for such assignments.
2. White teachers were divided in their attitude toward faculty desegregation. Some were enthusiastic in their endorsement of the inclusion

---

[14] Robert J. Dwyer, "The Negro Teacher and Desegregation," Sociology and Social Research, XLII (September-October, 1957), pp. 27-36.

of Negro teachers in the integration program, pointing to the shortage of qualified teachers and overcrowded classrooms as evidences of the need for faculty desegregation. Teachers that were opposed felt that Negro teachers would not be comfortable when in the minority or that there would be "awkward" social situations.

3. White students were indifferent to whether they had a Negro teacher. Many thought that it would be a good idea.
4. Negro students were indifferent, though several girls thought that it would be "nice to have someone to take your problems to."
5. School administrators and teachers felt that parents would constitute the greatest opposition to the placement of Negro teachers on formerly all-white faculties.
6. Parents of elementary children were thought to be the most antagonistic group because children of this age are more impressionable and would be influenced by the Negro culture.
7. Some administrators and teachers thought that Negro teachers would have difficulty handling discipline problems.
8. Negro teachers expressed ambivalent attitudes toward desegregation. They favored integration but not wholeheartedly unless they were included in the change.
9. Several Negro teachers had been retained in districts with segmental desegregation and reassigned to positions for which they had no training or experience.
10. All Negro teachers interviewed indicated that they would gladly accept a teaching position in a school that had no Negroes on the faculty.

The findings in this study led Dwyer to conclude that (1) white students are willing to accept Negro teachers; (2) on the basis of relatively easy acceptance of student integration it appears likely that some Negro teachers can be integrated without the appearance of major conflict; (3) the integration of qualified Negro teachers cannot be postponed too long without costly educational, economic, and psychological results; and (4) threatened displacement of Negro teachers will incite them to obstruct full integration of Negro pupils, which in effect supports segregation in education.

Mays[15] conducted an attitudinal study that differed in several respects from that of Dwyer's. While Dwyer studied the attitudes of individuals that had not experienced faculty desegregation, Mays' study involved persons that were employed in desegregated faculties. Mays included only teachers in his sample while several groups of school personnel were included in the sample of Dwyer. The Mays study was not specifically designed to study attitudes but behavioral expectations. He sensed that there might be significant differences in the behavioral expectations of Negro and white teachers on recently desegregated faculties and sought to determine if this were true.

The sample for this investigation consisted of thirty-three Negro teachers and thirty-two white teachers employed in desegregated faculties in Kentucky and southeastern Missouri. Mays developed an instrument with a series of statements that stimulated specific situations that would require interaction between white teachers and Negro teachers. Situations were also structured that would require interaction between teachers and administrators. Analysis of the data was accomplished through the use of Student's t test to determine significant differences between Negro and white teachers' expectations and behavior. No significant differences existed between white and Negro teachers in the amount of freedom desired to participate in social, controversial, and administrative activities. By probing for differences between teachers' desired freedom to behave and how they would actually behave, approximations of what their real behavior might be toward engaging in certain activities were obtained.

---

[15] Nebraska Mays, "Behavioral Expectations of Negro and White Teachers on Recently Desegregated Public School Faculties," Journal of Negro Education, XXXII (Summer, 1963), pp. 218-226.

The examination of the Negro-white socialization expectations provided approximations of the extent to which Negroes and whites on newly desegregated faculties indicated their acceptance of one another socially. The major findings of the investigation were:

1. No real difference existed between white and Negro expectations in their behavior toward administrators.
2. Negro teachers expressed an ambivalence of attitude toward their behavior in controversial activities.
3. Negro teachers showed greater reluctance to participate in activities requiring socialization with white teachers.
4. Negro teachers expressed a greater need for freedom to present the pros and cons of desegregation in the classroom.
5. Negro teachers expressed a significantly greater desire for freedom to participate in human rights and collective bargaining organizations, and also indicated that they would participate to a greater degree than whites.
6. Negro teachers expressed the desire for more freedom to by-pass channels, but indicated that they actually would by-pass no more channels than white teachers.
7. No relationship existed between the prior experience of Negro teachers in interracial matters and their willingness to associate socially with other teachers.

Another finding was that few differences were noted in actual expectations toward parent-teacher association participation, but Negro teachers did indicate greater reluctance toward participating in social affairs than white teachers. Older white teachers showed greater reluctance toward social interaction with Negro teachers. No relationship was evidenced between economic status of teachers and the extent to which they would actually become involved in social activities with other teachers.

The studies by Dwyer and Mays support the assumption that white teachers are willing to accept Negro teachers on desegregated faculties. The study by Mays indicates that white teachers are more willing to participate in intergroup social activities than are Negro teachers. This finding which indicates possible "Negro hesitancy" and strange feelings could be due to the sample having been drawn from recently desegregated faculties. The evidence did not indicate whether the reluctance and reticence of Negro teachers would be cumulative, or would disappear with the passing of time.

Two studies have been conducted to determine some of the procedures and processes utilized in desegregating faculties and how teachers and administrators evaluate their experiences with desegregated faculties. Coleman and Kaplan[16] co-directed an investigation of faculty desegregation in Kentucky that was sponsored by the Kentucky Commission on Human Rights. These researchers found that administrators and Negro teachers who were interviewed were highly pleased with the results of faculty desegregation. Most Negroes were serving as classroom teachers. A few were placed as personnel officers in schools. About one-sixth of the Negro teachers serving on desegregated faculties were serving in non-teaching assignments. Most of the districts with desegregated faculties were located in clusters around large urban centers.

The evidence indicated that few problems have arisen in the move to desegregate faculties; those problems that did develop centered around the placement of Negro teachers in, what other teachers thought of as soft jobs, such as library service. Superintendents, principals, and teachers were apprehensive about the change to racially mixed faculties. However, few of the expected problems developed.

The interviews conducted by Coleman and Kaplan revealed that most of the superintendents and principals utilized some preparation procedures. The procedures included were: (1) student orientation, (2) faculty discussion, (3) parent-teacher discussions, (4) involvement of the local ministerial association, and (5) private conferences with Negro teachers chosen to enter white faculties. Many of the school leaders indicated that the change was made as quietly as possible. The findings did not indicate whether there were differences in the success of the transition that were associated with preparation procedures.

---

[16] A. Lee Coleman and Sidney Kaplan, Faculty Integration in Public Schools (Frankfort, Kentucky: Commission on Human Rights, January 1962), 10 pp.

Coleman and Kaplan found considerable hesitancy on the part of superintendents and principals to place additional Negro teachers on desegregated staffs. Those Negro teachers that were employed were considered exceptions. It was thought that other Negro teachers would not work out as well. Most of the Negro teachers had long years of experience. Over two-thirds of them had been employed in their respective districts for over ten years and had continuing contracts.

Another finding of the study was that simultaneous faculty and student desegregation appeared to work as well as delayed faculty desegregation. Teachers that were desegregated along with students reported no more adverse experiences than teachers who entered the faculties of schools that had previously desegregated the student bodies.

The findings of the Coleman and Kaplan study indicated that in spite of the successful experiences with faculty desegregation, there is still a tendency on the part of school administrators to consider Negro teachers in terms of assumed group characteristics.

Spruill's[17] study bears out many of the findings of the Coleman and Kaplan study. He studied the consequences encountered by Negro teachers in the process of desegregation in four states— Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, and West Virginia. This study revealed that 60.4 per cent of the Negro teachers who returned questionnaires were employed at the elementary level, 25.7 per cent were employed at the junior high level, and 13.3 per cent at the senior high level. The remaining .7 per cent were employed in special schools. The data showed that 4.4 per cent of the teachers in the sample were serving as principals, 88.3 per cent as teachers, 1.5 per cent as supervisors, .7 per cent as guidance specialists, .7 percent as coaches, and 3.7 per cent as librarians. The majority of the teachers were serving in their major field of preparation (92.7 per cent).

---

[17] Albert Westley Spruill, "Consequences Encountered by Negro Teachers in the Process of Desegregation of School in Four Southern States" (Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Cornell University, 1958), 174 pp.

An analysis of the data revealed that Negro teachers felt that the physical facilities were the same or better than in the schools with segregated faculties from which they had come. They also felt that treatment by administrators was fair, that faculty members accepted them completely, and that they had gained in professional status. Approximately a third of the respondents thought that social conditions were better, while over one-half of the sample could see no change in social conditions. Those teachers reporting that social conditions were better cited as factors: evaluation on the basis of accomplishment, gain rather than loss in prestige and status, and interaction on an equalitarian basis.

The data yielded evidence that student-teacher relations were good, that there were few discipline problems, and that there was much student interest in learning. The Negro teachers indicated that parental relations were as good or better than at the Negro schools. Instead of rejection, the teachers in this sample indicated they found acceptance by parents. There was much cooperation by parents in regard to school matters, and a favorable attitude toward mixed social recreational functions in the schools.

Spruill also found that the status of Negro teachers in regard to consequences encountered improved with tenure in desegregated schools. Education was a big factor in the adjustment of teachers; most had attended desegregated institutions. Negro teachers that had attended segregated institutions responded more favorably than those that attended desegregated institutions, those on faculties more than two years responded more favorably than those of less than two years, and those with less-than-masters degrees more favorably than those with masters degrees.

There was little difference in the consequences encountered by Negro teachers in metropolitan areas where the population was majority-white and in smaller communities where the population was minority-white. In each community studied where Negro teachers felt the consequences were better there were good race relations prior to and following the Supreme Court decision, the educational leadership was firm, a considerable number of barriers in regard to social institutions had been lowered, and the Negro population was small in relation to the total population.[18]

This review of literature reveals that there is a lack of research on problems related to faculty desegregation. It also reveals, however, that there is some concern and awareness of the need for study and investigation of the process of faculty desegregation. The task of this investigation is to help fulfill the need for study on this problem.

---

[18] Ibid., p. 139.

CHAPTER IV

DESEGREGATION IN PUBLIC EDUCATION IN KENTUCKY

The study of an aspect of the desegregation process within a particular locality becomes more meaningful when there is a knowledge of the historical context within which the transition has taken place. The historical review of segregated and desegregated public education in Kentucky reveals continuous progress, though slow and halting at times, toward the provision of equal educational opportunities for Negroes and whites. However, this trend has not included the Negro teacher to the extent that it has included the Negro student.

Kentucky, as did other border and Southern states, had a dual system of education prior to 1955. This system of separate schools for Negro and white pupils was based on constitutional and legal provisions. The Kentucky General Assembly passed a law in 1874 that provided for the establishment of a system of common schools for Negroes. This system of schools for Negroes was to be supported wholly by sources of revenue gathered from Negro citizens. The law provided that the fund would consist of money collected from a tax on Negro property; a one dollar per head tax on all Negro males that were twenty-one years old and older; and the income from fines paid by Negroes, license fees, penalties, deeds, and forfeitures.[1] The enactment of this law gave Kentucky two systems of common schools, one for white children and the other for Negro children.

In 1883, this divided system of common schools was replaced by one based on the broad principles of equal taxation and equal support that was written into the constitution of 1891. This statute provided that there would be a common school fund to be distributed to white and Negro children in the same proportion.[2]

---

[1] History of Education in Kentucky (Frankfort: Kentucky Department of Education, 1914), p. 133.

Kentucky was the last of the Southern states to pass a compulsory school-segregation law. A law of this nature was passed in 1904. At this time Berea College had a biracial student body, as had been true since 1866. The law was passed specifically to prevent Berea College from operating integrated classes but it applied to all schools in the state of Kentucky. This law firmly entrenched separate schools for the two races at all levels. The law, which was known as the Day Law, decreed that each board of education was to maintain separate schools for the white and Negro children residing in the district and that no person was to operate or maintain any college, school, or institution where persons of both the white and Negro races were to be received as students. Teachers were prohibited from teaching biracial classes and Negro and white students could not attend biracial classes.[3]

A law enacted in 1936 was the outgrowth of an increasing awareness that the education of Negroes was the responsibility of all citizens of Kentucky. This law made independent school districts as well as county ones responsible for providing, either by establishment or by contract, at least an approved twelve-grade school program for Negroes.[4] Prior to this time the county districts had the responsibility of providing an educational program for Negro children residing within an independent district that embraced a fifth or sixth class city. Some districts met their obligation by establishing additional schools for Negroes. Others made provisions for the Negro students at the secondary level to attend schools in other districts.

---

[2] Mose E. Ligon, A History of Public Education in Kentucky (Bulletin of the Bureau of School Services; Vol. XIV, No. 4; Lexington: University of Kentucky, June 1942), p. 249.

[3] Kentucky Revised Statutes, Annotated (Baldwin, 1943), sec. 158.020.

[4] Kentucky Statutes (Baldwin's Annotated Revision of Carroll's Statutes, 1936), sec. 4399-3.

During the period of separate schools for Negroes, Kentucky made an effort to provide adequate educational opportunities for both groups of students. Kentucky had a smaller differential between the educational provisions for both races than did most of the Southern and border states. Yet, there was still much prejudice on the part of the majority population that was reflected in marked disparities between the educational provisions for Negro and white youth. A comparative study of white and Negro education by Leonard Meece[5] revealed that schools for whites in both rural and city areas were much superior to schools for Negroes in buildings and equipment. The city school districts had a median value per classroom that was twice as great for white schools as it was for Negro schools.

There was also much discrimination in the salaries of Negro and white teachers. Meece found a differential of 25 per cent in teachers' salaries that he attributed to discrimination. Reasons given for the difference in salary by superintendents were higher social standards and cost of living, quality of service, and public sentiment.

The inequities that existed in the educational programs were gradually being reduced during the years leading up to the Supreme Court decision. The salaries of teachers were equalized and schools for Negroes were provided with more instructional aids and materials than they had formerly received.

Desegregation of Higher Education in Kentucky

Desegregation began in Kentucky at the higher education level. The desegregation of the colleges in the state prior to the desegregation of the public schools is thought to have had some effect on the attitudes adopted in many communities toward the desegregation of the public schools.

In 1949, the federal courts ruled that the University of Kentucky was to open its graduate and professional schools to Negroes. This action was the result of a suit by Lyman Johnson, a Negro teacher. Several actions bordering on desegregation took place prior to the 1949 decision. In 1936, a fund was established that was used to provide financial assistance for Negro students who wanted to participate in graduate work out of the state. The funds were depleted by 1939. Due to the lack of funds for out-of-state study, two Negroes applied for admission to the University of Kentucky College of Law. They were not admitted but the governor made available from an emergency fund a sum of money which made possible the continued study of Negroes at out-of-state institutions.

---

[5] Leonard E. Meece, Negro Education in Kentucky (Bulletin of the Bureau of School Services; Vol. 1, No. 3; Lexington: University of Kentucky, 1938), p. 82.

In 1948, the State Board of Education announced an arrangement with Kentucky State College and the University of Kentucky for aiding Negro students who were not willing or able to secure education elsewhere. Students were to enroll at Kentucky State College for courses offered at the University. White instructors were to commute from the University to Kentucky State College to teach the Negro students. The Negro students were to use the library and other facilities at the University at times when white students were not using them. This plan lasted only a few weeks for the white instructors felt burdened and withdrew.[6]

The admission of Johnson and twenty-six other Negroes to the University of Kentucky in 1949 meant that Kentucky was the first state in the Southern region to admit Negroes to a public institution of learning that was attended by whites.

Desegregation of Students in the Public Schools

Desegregation of the public schools began in Kentucky in 1955, the year following the Supreme Court decision. Although Kentucky has been described as "the most southern of the border states with a strong social and sentimental link to the South," the Supreme Court decision was greeted with an attitude of compliance. Desegregation of schools has proceeded with a notable lack of resistance in most communities. A factor in the smoothness of the transition was the attitude taken by public officials toward the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court.

---

[6] Horace E. Tate, "Some Characteristics and Perceptions of Negro Undergraduates at the University of Kentucky" (Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1960), p. 27.

School leaders took the attitude that there would be problems but thinking and planning would lead to an orderly transition to desegregated schools. The statement of the president of the Louisville Board of Education is typical of those made by school officials: "Our thinking and planning must start right now even if the Court allows us five years to carry out desegregation."[7] The State Board of Education not only accepted the fact that segregation must give way to desegregation but passed resolutions urging school districts to begin the process of desegregation "as rapidly as conditions warrant."[8]

The governor of the state promptly announced that "Kentucky will do whatever is necessary to comply with the law." The attorney general regarded the state's segregation laws as dead. All of the senators and congressmen announced their support of the decision of the Court.[9]

Desegregation of students in Kentucky followed two patterns. Those districts with large numbers of Negro students adopted local option plans whereby Negro students could transfer to formerly all-white schools if they so desired or white students could transfer to Negro schools. Those districts that operated one-, two-, and three-teacher schools for Negroes absorbed these students into the schools for white students. This action, accompanied by the consolidation movement, resulted in the closing of many small schools for Negroes. From 1955-56 to 1963-64, the number of one-teacher elementary Negro schools was reduced from 148 to 22; the number of two-teacher schools from 43 to 15; and those with three or more teachers from 97 to 65. The number of elementary schools for Negroes was reduced from 60 to 28.[10] The closing of these schools in most cases was not accompanied by a transfer of the teachers along with the students to the schools that were attended by whites.

---

[7] Omer Carmichael and Weldon James, The Louisville Story (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957), p. 46.

[8] From the minutes of the Quarterly Meeting of the Kentucky State Board of Education held on June 23, 1955.

[9] The Courier Journal (May 18, 1954), Sec. 1, pp. 1, 3, 6.

An indication of the progress made in student desegregation can be gained by noting the number of school districts that have begun the transition to desegregated student bodies. During the 1955-1956 school year, 30 of the 182 districts with Negro students had some desegregated schools. This number increased by a wide margin in 1956-57 to 93 of 180 districts enrolling Negro students. By 1963-1964 there were 155 of 167 districts with Negro students that had some desegregated schools. During the 1963-1964 school year, 54 per cent of all Negro pupils were enrolled in biracial classes.[11]

The preceding discussion of student desegregation in Kentucky has been purposefully brief. This study is concerned with faculty desegregation. However, the presentation of some facts concerning student desegregation will serve to make certain discussions concerning faculty desegregation more intelligible to the reader. That the transition to desegregated student bodies has had its effects on the process of faculty desegregation is a fact that will become apparent in the ensuing discussion.

Developments in Faculty Desegregation

Though Kentucky has made rapid strides in the desegregation of students the same has not been true of faculty desegregation. There are several bases for this lag. Many teachers not on continuing contract did not have their contracts renewed when the Negro pupils that they were teaching transferred to formerly all-white schools. Other teachers were not willing to make the change or, feeling that dismissal was imminent, sought positions elsewhere. The underlying reason for these conditions was the conservatism and prejudice of parents, school boards, and school officials who were reluctant to entrust white children to Negro supervision. According to Kaplan and Coleman,[12] this reluctance was due to a fear of Negro incompetence and the desire to resist the elevation of Negroes to more respected social roles in the community.

---

[10] _Integration in Public Education: Report of Eight Years of Progress_ (Frankfort: Kentucky State Department of Education, November 1963), p. 6.

[11] _Ibid._, p. 7.

The realization that faculty desegregation would mean a realignment of social relationships that would effect a deeper and more basic reordering of the social structure of a community and, therefore, would be resisted more than student desegregation, concerned many people connected with the schools. The Kentucky Education Association recognized that Negro teachers would probably lose jobs in the move to desegregate schools. This realization moved the Association to adopt a resolution calling for the persuasion of boards of education to retain qualified Negro teachers and employ one Negro teacher for every fourteen to twenty-four Negro students.[13]

While there were superintendents and boards of education whose prejudiced attitudes and fears prohibited the consideration of biracial faculties, there were others who were concerned about the continued employment of Negro teachers. This concern was expressed in a 1955 meeting of board of education members and superintendents, but it apparently was overridden by biased attitudes and fear of community reactions, for no faculties were desegregated during the 1954-1955 and 1955-1956 school years.

The state board of education was cognizant of the need for the inclusion of Negro teachers as well as Negro students in desegregation plans. Awareness of the responsibility to provide direction and guidance to local districts involved in a process of social change resulted in a mild resolution being passed by the state board in 1956. The resolution stated that "each board of education is urged to study the local situation with regard to the placement of professional personnel and give due consideration to all qualified persons."[14] The vague and generalized nature of this resolution resulted in it having little effect at the local level. Coleman's summary of the status of employment of Negro teachers adequately describes conditions during the 1955-1957 school years:

---

[12] Sidney J. Kaplan and A. Lee Coleman, "The Strategy of Change: Contrasting Approaches to Teacher Integration," Social Science, XXXVIII (October 1963), p. 218.

[13] Southern School News (May 1955), p. 3.

> In the largest cities qualified teachers will hold on because white attitudes are more liberal, because racial segregation is likely to hold on for some time and because there is more aggressive Negro leadership. That some qualified Negro teachers will lose out seems inevitable, whether because of more conservative white attitudes, declining Negro population, or lack of effective Negro leadership or power.[15]

As student desegregation became more of a reality, school officials, realizing that there would soon be few Negro students in schools maintained for Negroes, became concerned over whether they were required to place Negro teachers with continuing contracts in predominantly white classrooms. The state attorney general ruled that in his opinion the statute governing the reduction of teachers referred to the two separate groups of teachers within a district. He also suggested that a test court case be instituted to clarify the issue. Six years later, in 1962, a different attorney general held that the statute required school districts to give priority to and retain teachers without reference to race or color.[16] Many school officials had interpreted the statute in this manner before the attorney general delivered his interpretation.

---

[14] Minutes of the Quarterly Meeting of the State Board of Education, June 14, 1956, Frankfort, Kentucky.

[15] A. Lee Coleman, "Desegregation of Public Schools in Kentucky — One Year Afterwards," Journal of Negro Education, XXIV (Spring, 1955), p. 250.

[16] Opinion of the Office of the Attorney General of Kentucky, OAG 62-759, August 27, 1962.

There is little reason to doubt that the legal requirements regarding the reduction of teachers have prompted many school officials to make provisions for the placement of Negro teachers with continuing contracts. The importance of the guarantee of continued employment as set forth in the tenure laws justifies an analysis of the statutes that relate to this problem.

Tenure of Teachers

Boards of education in Kentucky are required to enter into either a limited or continuing contract with all teachers employed in the state.[17] A limited contract is defined as a contract for the employment of a teacher for less than four years. A continuing contract is one that remains in force until the teacher resigns or retires or until it is terminated for certain specified reasons.

The section of the tenure laws that covers the continued employment of teachers states the following:

> Teachers eligible for continuing contract status in any school district shall be those teachers who meet the qualifications listed in this section.
>
> (a) Hold a standard or college certificate as defined in KRS 161.720;
>
> (b) When a teacher is recommended for re-employment after teaching four years in a district, the superintendent shall recommend said teacher for a continuing contract, and, unless the board of education by a four-fifths vote of its full membership rejects the continuing contract of the teacher, a written continuing contract shall be issued. If the board of education rejects the contract of the teacher recommended the superintendent may recommend employment of such teacher under a limited contract for not to exceed two years, but on subsequent re-employment only a written continuing contract shall be entered into. . . .[18]

---

[17] Kentucky Revised Statutes, 161.730 quoted in Kentucky Common Laws 1962 (Frankfort: Kentucky Department of Education, 1962), XXX, No. 5, p. 348.

[18] Kentucky Revised Statutes, 161.740 quoted in Kentucky Common School Laws, Ibid., p. 350.

The provisions set forth in this statute clearly indicate that if a teacher has given four years of satisfactory service and is recommended for a fifth year of service by the superintendent, which is not disapproved by the board of education, then the teacher is entitled to some guarantee against dismissal for unjustified reasons.

This statute outlines the responsibility of local school officials for providing continued employment for Negro and white teachers. However, the mentioned statute that deals with the reduction of teachers provided an escape for those administrators who have sought loopholes that could be utilized in phasing out Negro teachers. This statute states that:

> When by reason of decreased enrollment of pupils, or by reason of suspension of schools or territorial changes affecting the district, a board of education decides that it will be necessary to reduce the number of teachers, it shall have full authority to make reasonable reductions. But in making such reductions the board shall proceed to suspend contracts in accordance with the recommendation of the superintendent of schools who shall within each teaching field affected, give preference to teachers on continuing contract and to teachers who have greater seniority. Teachers whose contracts are suspended shall have the right of restoration in continuing service status in the order of seniority of service in the districts if and when teaching positions become vacant or are created for which any of such teachers are or become qualified.[19]

The statute relating to suspension of contracts reveals that there are legal means by which teachers with continuing contracts can be released other than professional incompetency, moral laxity, and similar unprofessional conduct. The statute clearly states that it is the prerogative of local boards of education to make reductions in the number of teachers within the limitations prescribed.

The responsibility of determining those teachers whose contracts are to be suspended is left entirely in the hands of superintendents. This makes it possible for superintendents who desire to dismiss Negro teachers to interpret the stipulations of the statute in various ways. For example, the clause "within each teaching field affected" could be interpreted to mean if a Negro teacher was a primary teacher, and there were no vacancies in the primary departments of schools within the district, then the teacher could be legally dismissed. The same interpretation could be applied to secondary teachers in specified fields.

---

[19] Kentucky Revised Statutes, 161.800, quoted in Kentucky Common School Laws, Ibid., pp. 356-57.

It is reasonable to assume from the number of teachers dismissed that superintendents exercised their authority to make reductions in the number of teachers by applying different interpretations to or disregarding that portion of the statute relating to continuing contract and seniority status in many cases.

The greatest amount of confusion concerning the statute and its requirements stemmed from the lack of a decision on whether it applied to Negro teachers and schools as a separate division from white teachers and schools, or whether it applied equally to white and Negro teachers. The issue was finally resolved by the opinion of the attorney general that has been previously mentioned.

The impression is not meant to be conveyed that all or a majority of the local school administrators questioned the applicability of the statute to both white and Negro teachers. Many school officials were certain that the statute applied equally to both groups of teachers. However, when the tremendous spurt is observed in the extent of faculty desegregation during the year following the clarification of the statute concerning the reduction of teachers, the conclusion is inevitable that this clarification operated to persuade some wavering officials to begin the process of faculty desegregation.[20]

Pattern of Faculty Desegregation

Faculty desegregation began in the public schools of Kentucky in the 1956-57 school year. Ten Negro teachers were transferred to formerly all-white faculties in five school districts. Only one of the first districts to desegregate was a large district. The others were small districts of less than 5,000 students. However, one-half of the Negro teachers that were placed in formerly all-white faculties were employed in this large district.

---

[20] See Table 1 on page 70 .

It is generally conceded that small communities that are somewhat isolated from mass media and cut off from the currents of change are usually most resistant to change. This leads to the preliminary assumption that the move to desegregated faculties in these districts was inconsistent with the general pattern of social change. But, when the geographical locations of these small districts are noted, their early moves become more plausible. Two of the districts are located near the large metropolitan city of Cincinnati, Ohio. The third one is located near Fort Knox, Kentucky. Both of these localities had desegregated faculties several years before the process began in the public school districts of Kentucky. It seems quite possible that the atmosphere of racial tolerance and respect for the ability of Negro teachers that existed in the two localities filtered through to those first districts in Kentucky that desegregated faculties.

There has been continued faculty desegregation since its inception in 1956-57. Table 1 shows that in 1957-58, there were 9 school districts with 17 Negro and 359 white teachers serving in desegregated faculties. This was an increase of 80. 0 per cent in the number of districts over the previous year. There was a 70. 0 per cent increase in the number of Negro teachers. However, the number of white teachers increased by only 18. 4 per cent.

The increase in the proportion of Negro teachers serving in desegregated faculties was greatest during the 1960-1961 school year. This was due to the large increase in the number of teachers serving in desegregated faculties in the Louisville district.

The number of Negro teachers in desegregated faculties increased greatly from 1956-1957 to 1963-1964, but the proportion of Negro teachers declined during this period. Negro teachers constituted 32. 7 per cent of the total number of teachers in bi-racial faculties during the first year of faculty desegregation. In 1963-1964, Negro teachers made up only 11. 1 per cent of the total number of teachers. The greatest increase in desegregated faculties during a single year took place in 1963-1964. The number of districts increased by 72. 0 per cent, the number of Negro

TABLE 1

ACCUMULATION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN KENTUCKY WITH DESEGREGATED FACULTIES DURING THE YEARS 1956-1957 TO 1963-1964

Year	Number of Districts	Teachers	
		Negro	White
1956-1957	5	10	306
1957-1958	9	17	359
1958-1959	11	20	360
1959-1960	13	33	566
1960-1961	14	104	595
1961-1962	17	119	763
1962-1963	25	142	1215
1963-1964	43	246	2292

teachers by 74.4 per cent, and the number of white teachers by 91.5 per cent. This tremendous increase in the desegregation of faculties followed a decision by the State Board of Education to take a more aggressive role in the desegregation process. A member of the staff of the State Department of Education was directed to visit districts that had not desegregated and help them develop plans of action.[21]

The guidance and assistance provided by state officials is thought to have been a factor in the progress made in faculty desegregation in 1963-1964.

The second largest district in the state, the Louisville district, did not begin faculty desegregation until two years after student desegregation was initiated.

---

[21] Minutes of the Quarterly Meeting of the Kentucky State Board of Education, September 19, 1962, Frankfort, Kentucky.

The great strides made in faculty desegregation in this district since its inception, however, have resulted in many more Negro teachers being assigned to bi-racial faculties in this district than in any other. In 1963-1964, slightly over one-half of all Negro teachers serving on desegregated faculties were located in the Louisville district.

Pattern of Placement of Negro Teachers

The role of the Negro teacher in desegregated faculties during the first six years of mixed faculties followed two patterns of development. One group of districts placed Negro teachers as librarians. Another group of districts placed Negro teachers in classrooms as regular classroom teachers. Apparently, the use of Negro teachers as librarians was an attempt to abide by the statutes pertaining to tenure and at the same time accommodate the sensitivities of communities that would reject Negro teachers in roles as regular classroom teachers. Kaplan and Coleman[22] described the pattern of placement thusly:

> For the most part the Negro teachers in the Louisville area were used as classroom teachers with the same responsibilities which they previously had in Negro schools. In the Central Kentucky area, on the other hand, the teachers played new roles. . . . Obviously, the problem of teacher integration in the central part of the state was handled in a more temporizing fashion. The Negro teachers were not really teaching; they functioned as librarians with more of a service than a supervisory relationship to their pupils. A Negro librarian poses less of a threat to the traditional "caste" system than would a Negro classroom teacher. After all a white pupil may or may not visit the library. And even if he must visit the library on assignment, the relationship may be a fleeting one.

These authors offer the following explanation for the difference in the pattern of placement in the Louisville area:

---

[22] Kaplan and Coleman, op. cit., p. 219.

> In contrast to the central area, the Louisville area . . . has a large and organized Negro minority which has exerted continual pressure. Moreover, the large number of Negro teachers on continuing contract precluded the librarian stratagem. And the more urbanized situation made for more professional and impersonal relations.[23]

The use of Negro teachers as librarians during the early years of faculty desegregation was to be a transition step to the placement of Negro teachers as regular classroom teachers in some districts. However, once the Negro teachers were placed as librarians, few changed to teaching positions. The general pattern followed in placing teachers that did drop the librarian role was a two-step one. The teachers moved from the library to become "special" or "remedial reading" teachers; the following year they became regular classroom teachers.

Another aspect of placement that deserves some attention is the school level at which Negro teachers have been assigned. A small proportion of the Negro teachers assigned to desegregated faculties have been assigned to secondary schools. In 1960-1961, only 8.6 per cent of all Negro teachers in desegregated faculties were serving at the secondary level. This proportion had increased to 24.1 per cent in 1963-1964. At this time, 59 of the 246 Negro teachers were assigned to secondary schools.

Two implications can be drawn from this increase in the proportion of Negro teachers serving in desegregated faculties of secondary schools: (1) more Negro teachers are being hired to teach in secondary schools with desegregated faculties, and (2) as all-Negro secondary schools are abolished more of the teachers are being placed at the secondary level rather than being shifted to elementary school positions or released.

Several districts have had the problem of placing Negro secondary teachers compounded by the fact that their Negro high schools were attended by Negro students from other districts. The district that operated the school was the employer of the teachers and, therefore, legally responsible, though the teachers were employed to teach students from other districts. Upon desegregation of the schools, the Negro pupils returned to their home districts leaving the districts that operated the Negro school with an excess number of Negro teachers. Provisions were made for these teachers by creating positions and assigning them to elementary classrooms in schools for Negroes in many instances.

---

[23] Ibid.

Legal Aspects

Of the several factors and conditions that have operated to produce changes in race relations, the action of courts and other bodies empowered to hand down legal and semi-legal mandates have probably been most effective. Court decisions have added legal sanction to moral and ethical precepts that have operated to produce changes in patterns of interaction between the white and Negro races.

Courts have taken the position in several cases that faculty desegregation should be considered a part of the over-all plan to desegregate the schools. Two U. S. District Court judges ordered the desegregation of faculties to begin in four school districts in Kentucky in the 1963-1964 school year. In the case of Lawrence v. Bowling Green Board of Education, a district judge handed down a decision ordering complete integration of all pupils in the Bowling Green school district, and that faculty members be assigned without regard to race or color.[24] Three other school districts in Kentucky were specifically ordered to desegregate faculties along with pupils by a different U. S. District Court judge. The Frankfort Board of Education, the Richmond Board of Education, and the Jessamine County Board of Education were directed to assign teachers and other personnel on a basis other than color and race.[25]

These decisions of the courts make it possible to predict the position that courts will take in future cases concerning desegregation of staffs along with students. There is little reason to doubt that faculty desegregation will be ordered to take place along with student desegregation in any additional cases that reach the courts. These decisions by legal bodies ordering faculty desegregation will insure the continued employment of Negro teachers already serving in districts that are making the transition to desegregated faculties. However, these decisions will not affect the hiring of additional teachers.

---

[24] Race Relations Law Reporter, VIII (Vanderbilt University School of Law, Spring-Summer, 1963), p. 75.

[25] Ibid., pp. 945, 949, 950.

Another type of legal problem that courts have been called on to settle involves Negro teachers who claim that they have been dismissed for unjustified reasons. A Circuit Court suit has been filed by a former Negro principal charging that he was dismissed from his position because there would be a problem of placing him in the gradual plan of desegregation. The board of education that had formerly employed the Negro principal stated that he was dismissed for neglect of duty. A Kentucky statute provides for the dismissal of teachers under the following circumstances: insubordination, immoral character, conduct unbecoming to the employee, inefficiency, incompetency, physical or mental disability, neglect of duty, dishonesty, and drunkenness.[26]

Under Kentucky laws, "neglect of duty" is a valid cause for dismissal, but the central issue in the case before the Circuit Court is whether or not there was actual neglect of duty, or was this just a convenient excuse for dismissing the principal. Neglect of duty is a very general term. Many small and seemingly insignificant acts that would go unnoticed under ordinary circumstances can be made to appear as neglect of duty when an effort is being made to establish grounds for dismissal. This means that it may be quite difficult to prove that dismissal was due to race and color (as the principal charged) if the school board has been diligent in recording behavior that was considered a neglect of duty.

The Kentucky State Board of Education, though not empowered to render legal decisions, has adopted a resolution that has implications for the process of faculty desegregation.[27] The resolution gives the State Board of Education the power to disapprove the distribution of Minimum Foundation funds to those districts that have discriminated against Negro personnel. The loss of these funds would make it virtually impossible for many small school districts to provide any semblance of an adequate program of education. This method of exerting indirect pressure on school officials should, at least, stimulate many school boards and superintendents to consider hiring and assigning additional Negro teachers to faculties within their respective districts. It is axiomatic that when discrimination becomes financially costly there is less resistance to changing to nondiscriminatory practices.

---

[26] Kentucky Revised Statutes, 161.828, quoted in Kentucky Common School Laws, op. cit., p. 355.

The Status of Faculty Desegregation

In order to fully comprehend the implications of factors related to faculty desegregation some knowledge of the present status of faculty desegregation is necessary. The subjects for this study are taken from the public school districts of Kentucky. It is possible that there may be peculiarities revealed by the data that are difficult to understand without some additional knowledge of the status of faculty desegregation in Kentucky.

Summary attention has already been given to the number of desegregated districts, but additional information is needed to answer questions such as: (1) Which school districts have desegregated faculties? (2) How many teachers are serving in desegregated faculties in these districts? (3) How many students attend schools with desegregated faculties? (4) What is the ratio of Negro to white teachers and Negro to white students in schools with desegregated faculties?

The purpose of the following discussion is to answer the questions raised above. The data used in this discussion are based on reports filed with the Kentucky State Department of Education for the school year 1963-1964.

---

[27] Minutes of the Quarterly Meeting of the State Board of Education, Frankfort, Kentucky, December 16, 1964.

Table 2 reveals that during the 1963-1964 school year there were 25 county and 18 independent districts with desegregated faculties. The range in the number of Negro teachers serving on desegregated faculties is from one to 125 per district. There are approximately five times as many white students attending schools with desegregated faculties as there are Negro students. The ratio of Negro to white students is 1 to 5.03. The ratio of Negro teachers to white teachers is 1 to 9.3. There was a total of 2,538 teachers of both races assigned to desegregated faculties during 1963-1964. Of this number, 246 were Negro teachers and 2,292 were white teachers. The 11,480 Negro students and 57,665 white ones gave a total of 69,145 students in schools with desegregated faculties.

Calculations from Table 2 also reveal that the mean number of Negro teachers per district was 5.7 and the mean number of white teachers was 53.3. These means give a distorted impression, though, for the Louisville district had over one-half of the Negro teachers assigned to desegregated faculties, while the number of white teachers in this district constituted less than one-fourth of the total number of white teachers.

There were 73 elementary schools, 11 junior high schools, and 25 senior high schools with desegregated faculties in 1963-1964. The majority of these schools had only one Negro teacher on the staff. In fact, 19 of the 43 districts with desegregated faculties had only one Negro teacher in the district assigned to a formerly all-white staff. Four of the districts classified as large districts, according to the criteria stated in Chapter I, are among the seven districts with six or more Negro teachers. The districts that have only one Negro teacher assigned to desegregated faculties have no all-Negro schools.

A much larger proportion of Negro teachers have been employed in desegregated faculties of elementary schools than their white counterparts. The total number of Negro and white teachers serving at the elementary and secondary levels in desegregated faculties was as follows:

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN KENTUCKY WITH DESEGREGATED FACULTIES AND STUDENTS IN 1963-1964

District	Teachers		Students	
	Negro	White	Negro	White
County				
Bath[a]	2	36	71	959
Bourbon	3	39	62	698
Boyle	1	27	13	513
Bullitt	1	31	13	852
Daviess	1	19	2	80
Fayette	8	253	256	5922
Franklin	1	51	72	1285
Hancock	1	17	5	439
Harlan	10	63	209	1407
Harrison	4	17	87	602
Jefferson	4	44	176	1341
Jessamine	6	118	290	2774
Knott	1	15	35	462
Lincoln	1	14	5	399
Lyon	1	24	13	611
Madison	4	88	70	2188
Marion	2	12	29	343
Mason	1	14	65	968
Meade	2	3	82	1190
Nicholas	1	13	39	344
Owen	1	34	51	750
Perry	3	7	30	2098
Scott	4	78	251	1792
Warren	7	54	232	1648
Woodford	4	53	209	1095
Independent				
Ashland	2	31	31	906
Bardstown	1	20	70	392
Bowling Green	1	17	127	416
Campbellsville	1	21	30	385
Caverna	1	15	14	355

TABLE 2—Continued

District	Teachers		Students	
	Negro	White	Negro	White
Elizabethtown	4	65	278	1394
Erlanger	1	31	44	380
Frankfort	8	40	218	929
Georgetown	1	16	69	418
Greenup	1	9	27	233
Harrodsburg	1	36	106	857
Hazard	2	43	59	944
Louisville	125	449	7315	9344
Maysville	6	50	232	1105
Middlesboro	5	30	67	880
Newport	5	69	102	1928
Owensboro	5	119	288	2641
Pikeville[a]	2	15	10	3398
Total	246	2292	11480	57665
	Mean = 5.7	Mean = 53.3		

[a] These districts did not have desegregated faculties in the Fall of 1964.

Negro

Elementary	186.5
Secondary	59.5

(One Negro teacher served at both levels.)

White

Elementary	1134
Secondary	1158

Calculations from the data given above revealed that 75.9 per cent of the Negro teachers were serving at the elementary level, while 49.5 per cent of the white teachers were serving at this level. The proportion of Negro teachers serving at the secondary level was slightly less than one-half of the proportion of white teachers serving at this level. Additional calculations revealed that 24.1 per cent of the Negro teachers and 50.5 per cent of the white teachers were assigned to secondary schools with desegregated faculties in 1963-1964.

The Present Status of Faculty Desegregation in Other Border States

An attempt was made to determine the present status of faculty desegregation in other border states and the District of Columbia by writing to the state departments of education. Information was requested concerning the number of school districts with desegregated faculties and the number of Negro and white teachers serving on these faculties. The states of Delaware, Maryland, Missouri, and Oklahoma were unable to supply any information regarding the extent of faculty desegregation. These states no longer keep records of the race of students and teachers.

The report from the state of West Virginia stated that all 55 school districts had both desegregated student bodies and desegregated faculties. No records are kept in this state of the number of white and Negro teachers serving on desegregated faculties.

The District of Columbia was very helpful in supplying information about the extent of faculty desegregation. A report prepared in October, 1964, was sent from which it was possible to calculate the number of teachers serving in desegregated faculties. Of the 144 elementary schools, 12 have all-white faculties and 36 have all-Negro faculties. Ninety-six elementary schools have desegregated faculties, with 443 white teachers and 1906 Negro teachers assigned to these schools. Of the 25 junior high schools, 23 have desegregated faculties. Two schools have all-Negro faculties. There are 283 white teachers and 997 Negro teachers assigned to junior high schools with desegregated faculties. All 11 senior high schools in the District of Columbia have desegregated faculties. The schools are staffed by 327 white teachers and 429 Negro teachers.

Calculations from the data supplied by the District of Columbia revealed that 85.5 per cent of all Negro and white teachers are serving in desegregated faculties. This evidence indicates that the District of Columbia has made much progress in the desegregation and integration of faculties.

Chapter Summary

This chapter has treated the whole spectrum of segregation and desegregation in the State of Kentucky. The efforts made in Kentucky to provide education for both races received added impetus from the Supreme Court decision of 1954. There was no threat to destroy the public school system, but a renewed effort to provide an adequate program of education on a desegregated basis. Though haltingly at first, Kentucky has moved to provide continued employment for Negro as well as white teachers. This movement has not been as widespread as student desegregation, but many school officials are concerned with the problems inherent in providing employment for Negro teachers through the desegregation of faculties. State education leaders have used gentle persuasion, and the courts have used judicial decrees to speed the process of faculty desegregation. The process thus far has involved minimal numbers of teachers working together at all levels of public education.

This chapter has been mainly concerned with "how much" faculty desegregation and where it has taken place. The next chapter will deal with factors that influence and relate to faculty desegregation. They are the real determiners of the "how much" and the "where" in so many instances.

CHAPTER V

PREPARATION FOR FACULTY DESEGREGATION

The purpose of this chapter of the study is to analyze procedures and processes that have been utilized in preparing for faculty desegregation and in implementing the change. The data used for this analysis were obtained through interviews with 88 school administrators in 38 public school districts in Kentucky.

The administrators were serving in the following capacities: superintendents, 36; assistant superintendents, 2; elementary principals, 31; secondary principals, 19.

The administrators gave general information concerning preparation procedures and also answered specific questions that were posed by the writer. The interviews were structured so that information could be gathered concerning not just those activities and procedures that have been utilized in reducing community, staff, and student resistance, but all phases of the thinking and planning that have accompanied the faculty desegregation process. The responses from administrators have been classified in various ways in order to determine the relationship between certain variables and preparation procedures. The primary classification of the data is by size of school district. The 38 school districts in which interviews were held were arbitrarily divided into two groups, using the number of students in each district as a criterion. Those districts with 5,000 or more students were classified as large districts; those districts with under 5,000 students were classified as small districts. Most of the large districts are centered around large urban communities. The small districts are located in small communities that are mostly rural and rural-urban.

The Decision to Desegregate Faculties

Before any change takes place that is the result of a new policy, a decision has to be made that the change will take place. The reasons for making decisions often influence the choice of methods and procedures to initiate change. The reasons given by administrators for the decision to begin the process of faculty desegregation reveal that there are several forces that have precipitated decisions to desegregate.

The replies of superintendents were used in the analysis of reasons for the decision to initiate faculty desegregation. Principals were asked also why the decision had been made in order to get a more accurate account of the reasons for the decision.

The majority of the superintendents from small districts indicated that a desire to close Negro schools was the primary reason for the decision to desegregate faculties. Table 3 shows that 53.6 per cent of the superintendents gave this reason. It was given by only 30.0 per cent of the superintendents of large districts.

Various underlying reasons were given for the desire to close schools for Negroes. One-half of the administrators who listed a desire to close schools for Negroes as the primary reason for the decision, stated that decreases in attendance at these schools resulted in few students and in exorbitant operating cost. Many pupils had transferred to predominantly white schools in many districts. In other districts, the total number of Negroes was decreasing due to migration to other areas. Two superintendents from small districts stated that high schools had been operated that were attended by Negro pupils from the surrounding county which provided no Negro high school. These Negro pupils were integrated into the formerly all-white high schools in their home districts, thus, substantially reducing the number of pupils in the high school for Negroes. The remaining enrollment was so small that it was impossible to operate an effective program of learning in these schools.

TABLE 3

PRIMARY REASONS FOR THE DECISION TO DESEGREGATE FACULTIES IN THIRTY-EIGHT SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN KENTUCKY

Reason	Small Districts		Large Districts		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
To close Negro schools	15	53.6	3	30.0	18	47.4
Court decision	4	14.3	1	10.0	5	13.1
Realized inevitability	5	17.8	1	10.0	6	15.8
Employment on competency	3	10.7	5	50.0	8	21.1
Morally "right"	1	3.6	-	-	1	2.2
Total	28	100.0	10	100.0	38	100.0

In six districts, the dilapidated state of the schools for Negroes was given as the reason for the decision to close them. Administrators from these districts reported that the buildings in which Negro pupils and teachers were housed were old and unfit for classroom use. School officials did not want to build new schools for Negroes for they realized that Negro students soon would be integrated into the predominantly white schools. The solution was to close the Negro schools. Three superintendents from these same districts reported that consolidation plans called for all schools in the district to become a part of consolidated schools. Both Negro and white schools that were in a state of disrepair were abandoned. The faculties and students from both groups of schools were brought together in newly constructed consolidated schools.

Other reasons given for the decision to close schools for Negroes serve as examples of extraneous factors that affect the process of faculty desegregation. The decision was made to close schools for Negroes and desegregate faculties in two districts because Urban Renewal officials were willing to purchase the old Negro school buildings. Another district made the decision to discontinue the operation of a school for Negroes because a company that had provided a building for use as a Negro school found a need for its building.

In 21.1 per cent of the districts included in this study, the decision was made to desegregate faculties in order to provide for assignments on the basis of competency and qualifications. This reason was given more often by superintendents from large districts than by superintendents from small districts. Fifty per cent of the superintendents from large districts gave the above reason for the decision to desegregate faculties. Only 10.7 per cent of the superintendents from small districts reported that faculties were desegregated in order to provide for assignments on the basis of competency and qualifications.

Table 3 reveals that 15.8 per cent of the superintendents stated that the realization that faculty desegregation was inevitable due to court decisions was the primary reason for the decision to desegregate faculties. The interviews held with these respondents revealed that they felt that faculty desegregation would be ordered by courts eventually, and that it was better to begin the process voluntarily than to wait and be forced to do so. The following two statements made by superintendents are typical of those made by the respondents who gave the above reason for the decision to desegregate faculties:

> We felt that sooner or later we would have to make the change, and saw no reason for waiting until we were forced to integrate.

* * *

> The feeling of the Board was that it was better for us to go ahead and develop and implement a plan for desegregation than have the courts do it for us.

A greater proportion of the small districts have made the decision to desegregate faculties as a result of the belief that the transition was inevitable. This belief was responsible for the decision in five small districts (17.8 per cent) and in one large district (10.0 per cent).

Court decrees were responsible for the decision to desegregate faculties in five districts. One of the small districts that desegregated under court order was not specifically ordered to desegregate faculties. The school officials assumed that the mandate included teachers as well as students and began to prepare for the desegregation of faculties.

One superintendent stated that the decision was made to desegregate faculties because it was felt to be morally and professionally right to do so.

Responses from principals supported the statements of superintendents in most cases. Of those principals replying, 46.0 per cent indicated that a desire to close the Negro schools was the primary reason for the decision to desegregate faculties. A greater percentage of principals than superintendents felt that the primary reason was to provide for the assignment of teachers on the basis of competency and qualifications. This response was given by 32.0 per cent of the principals. Six per cent of the principals felt that a realization of the inevitability of faculty desegregation was primarily responsible for the decision. This same percentage thought that the decision was made because faculty desegregation was felt to be morally and professionally right. Ten per cent of the principals did not have an opinion concerning the reason for the decision.

More than one reason was given for the decision to desegregate faculties by many of the respondents. An analysis of the responses revealed that 31.8 per cent of the administrators felt that a secondary reason for the decision to desegregate faculties was a conviction that it was morally and professionally right to do so. Eight per cent said that a desire to assign teachers on the basis of competency and qualifications was an underlying reason for the decision. About one-fifth (20.5 per cent) of the administrators stated that the continuing contract status of Negro teachers was a secondary reason for the decision to desegregate faculties.

These date show that a desire to close small Negro schools has been primarily responsible for the decision to desegregate faculties in about one-half of the school districts included in this study. In almost a fourth of the districts, the decision was motivated by moral and professional principles. School officials in these districts, reportedly, were concerned with providing equal opportunities for teachers as well as students. Court actions and perceived threats of court action were influential in the decisions in over one-fourth of the districts. It appears that circumstances that developed as a result of student desegregation and changing patterns of school organization were more influential in the decision to desegregate faculties than convictions based on humanistic principles.

Responses from administrators revealed that other school districts with desegregated faculties did not greatly influence the decision to begin the process of faculty desegregation. Only 20.5 per cent of the respondents indicated that other districts with desegregated faculties definitely influenced the decision. An additional 12.5 per cent of the administrators indicated that other districts with desegregated faculties had slightly influenced the decision. Over one-half (53.4 per cent) of the respondents reported that faculty desegregation in other districts had no influence on the decision to desegregate. No opinion was the response given by 13.6 per cent of the interviewees.

The 29 administrators who indicated that other districts had influenced the decision to desegregate faculties reported several different influences. Two of the respondents said that they observed that Negro teachers had been assigned as librarians, and that this procedure had worked well. The techniques used by other districts were observed in order to avoid possible pitfalls, so reported five respondents. Nine administrators said that reports that Negro teachers were doing an excellent job in desegregated faculties influenced the decision to initiate faculty desegregation. Thirteen of the respondents said that the smoothness with which faculty desegregation had taken place in other districts led to the belief that their districts would accept the transition.

The analysis of the responses regarding the influence of other districts with desegregated faculties on the decision to desegregate reveals that the success that other districts have had with the transition had some influence on the decision of school officials to begin the process. This influence has not been widespread. Most school officials apparently made the decision because of conditions that existed in their communities and because of their own personal convictions.

Methods of Determining Readiness

It is generally conceded that readiness is an important factor in the acceptance of social changes such as faculty desegregation. Often, when readiness for change does not exist, it is necessary to employ procedures that will increase readiness. Since faculty desegregation is regarded as a process that will be strongly resisted in some communities, it would appear to be desirable to use some method of determining readiness for the transition. The use of a method of determining readiness provides knowledge of prevailing attitudes and possible sources of resistance. The knowledge gained from the determination of readiness makes it possible for school officials to chart courses of action with more confidence and accuracy.

An analysis of responses shows that some method was used to determine the extent of community readiness for faculty desegregation by most administrators. The most frequently used method of determining readiness was the evaluation of student desegregation. This method was used by 34. 1 per cent of the respondents. A larger proportion of administrators from large districts used the above method of determining readiness, while 25. 4 per cent of the administrators from small districts used this method.

Informal talks were held with community leaders in order to determine readiness for faculty desegregation by 23. 9 per cent of the respondents. This procedure was used to a greater extent by administrators from small districts (30. 5 per cent) than by administrators from large districts (10. 3 per cent).

It is interesting to note that no respondents from large districts used talks with parents or discussions with parent-teacher association leaders to determine community readiness for faculty desegregation. Both of these methods were used by 5. 9 per cent of the administrators from small districts.

The recommendation of citizens' committees was used as a method of determining readiness by 11. 8 per cent of the administrators from small districts and 17. 3 per cent of the administrators from large districts. These committees were not formed just to make recommendations concerning faculty desegregation, but all phases of the school desegregation process. This method was used by 13. 6 per cent of the total group of respondents. The intuition of the school board members and superintendent was used to determine readiness for faculty desegregation according to the report of 9. 1 per cent of the administrators interviewed. These respondents indicated that the school officials had been in the community for many years and were well aware of community attitudes and traditions. Two administrators (3. 3 per cent) reported that parents were polled in order to determine readiness for the transition to desegregated faculties. This was done by sending notices to parents that requested that they indicate whether they objected to their children being taught by Negro teachers. One respondent reported that, in addition to evaluating the progress in student desegregation, a Negro substitute teacher was used to determine readiness in the school and community. The substitute teacher was well received by both teachers and students. There were no unfavorable reactions from parents. These developments served to completely convince the respondent that the community was ready for faculty desegregation.

No method was used to determine readiness for faculty desegregation by 6. 8 per cent of the respondents. Four of the six respondents were associated with schools and districts that had assigned Negro teachers to positions other than regular classroom teaching. Apparently some attention was given to the state of community readiness by these administrators that was not recognized as such, for they indicated that they felt that the community would more readily accept Negro teachers as librarians than as regular classroom teachers. Three administrators gave no response because they were not in the district when faculty desegregation was initiated and had no reliable source of information concerning the methods used to determine readiness.

Table 4 summarizes the methods used to determine readiness for faculty desegregation. The methods used can be classified as informal methods and specific methods. Informal methods include talks with community leaders, board and superintendent intuition, and evaluation of student desegregation. Specific methods include talks with affected parents (those parents whose children would be taught by Negro teachers), discussions with parent-teacher association leaders, polls of parents, and recommendations of citizens committees. Classification of responses in this manner reveals that 67.1 per cent of the total group of administrators used informal methods of determining readiness. Specific methods were used by 22.7 per cent of the respondents. These data show that administrators consider it important to know the extent of readiness for faculty desegregation, and have used various methods for determining readiness. Most administrators have used methods of determining readiness that involved a subjective analysis of certain community conditions and the community climate. The particular method used, so administrators reported, was helpful in charting courses of action that were followed in initiating the change to desegregated faculties.

Community Preparation

Changes, such as the desegregation of faculties, are often resisted because there are individuals within a community who are not willing to accept these changes. As has been stated, prejudiced attitudes, beliefs concerning the relative competency of teachers, social customs, and conservatism on the part of community members and school officials operate to create resistance to faculty desegregation. Where these conditions are known to exist, there is little reason to doubt that some form of preparation for the change to desegregated faculties would result in a more successful experience. The use of procedures to change negative attitudes toward faculty desegregation helps create a community atmosphere that is more favorable to the transition.

In order to determine the kind and extent of community preparation for faculty desegregation, administrators were asked: "In what way was a program of community preparation for the change developed and initiated?" The replies to this question, shown in Table 5, reveal the different procedures that have been used to prepare communities for faculty desegregation. Several respondents indicated that two methods were used to prepare communities. Twelve of the 18

TABLE 4

METHODS USED BY ADMINISTRATORS FOR DETERMINING READINESS FOR FACULTY DESEGREGATION IN THIRTY-EIGHT SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN KENTUCKY

Method	Small Districts		Large Districts		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Evaluation of student desegregation	15	25.4	15	51.7	30	34.1
Informal talks with community leaders	18	30.5	3	10.3	21	23.9
Discussions with PTA leaders	3	5.1	-	-	-	3.4
Recommendation of citizens committee	7	11.9	5	17.3	12	13.6
School board and superintendent intuition	6	10.3	2	6.9	8	9.1
Talks with affected parents	3	5.1	-	-	3	3.4
Poll of parents	2	3.3	-	-	2	2.3
No method	2	3.3	4	13.8	6	6.8
No response	3	5.1	1	1	3	3.4
Total	59	100.0	29	100.0	88	100.0

administrators listing talks by school officials to civic groups as the primary method of community preparation were located in districts that were desegregating faculties and students concurrently. The preparation procedures were used to create a favorable climate for both student and faculty desegregation. Four of the administrators that used discussions with parent-teacher association leaders were located in school districts that desegregated students and faculties at once.

TABLE 5

PROCEDURES UTILIZED BY ADMINISTRATORS TO PREPARE COMMUNITIES FOR FACULTY DESEGREGATION IN THIRTY-EIGHT SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN KENTUCKY

Procedure	Small Districts		Large Districts		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Talks to civic groups by school officials	13	22.0	5	17.3	18	20.5
News media involved in preparation	12	20.3	8	27.6	20	22.7
Discussions in PTA meetings	7	11.9	-	-	7	8.0
Informed key community leaders	3	5.1	1	3.4	4	4.5
Talks with affected parents	2	3.4	1	3.4	3	3.4
Placed Negro teachers in contact positions	2	3.4	1	3.4	3	3.4
Preparation for student desegregation was adequate	8	13.6	4	13.8	12	13.6
No preparation	25	42.4	14	48.2	39	44.3
No response	3	5.1	-	-	3	3.4

There are no column totals because some administrators reported the use of more than one procedure.

A slightly larger percentage of administrators from small districts reported that talks by school officials to civic groups were used to prepare communities for faculty desegregation. An analysis of responses showed that 22.0 per cent of the small district administrators and 17.3 per cent of the large district administrators used this method. Further analysis showed that about one-fifth (20.5 per cent) of the total group of respondents used the above mentioned method of preparation.

News media cooperation in preparing the community for the change to desegregated faculties was reported by 22.7 per cent of all the respondents. Most of these respondents (17.0 per cent) said that the news media helped most by adopting an editorial position that was favorable to desegregation in general. Seven administrators reported that newspapers had stressed the need for compliance with the Supreme Court decisions. Four other administrators said that newspapers helped in preparing the community by printing favorable editorials and by giving attention to the Negro athletes as well as the white ones in sports articles.

Two respondents were of the opinion that the announcement, through the news media, of the decision to desegregate faculties several months before the process is begun gives that community an opportunity to "get used to the idea." These two administrators used newspapers, radio, and television to announce the decision to desegregate faculties. The announcement was made about four months prior to the placement of Negro and white teachers on the same faculties.

Though 22.7 per cent of all administrators reported that news media helped prepare the community, only 6.8 per cent of these respondents indicated that news media had helped prepare the community in other than a general way. It appears that news media have contributed most to preparation for faculty desegregation by reflecting the changing status of the Negro and by reporting news concerning racial issues in a non-prejudicial manner.

Key community leaders were used to prepare communities for the change to desegregated faculties by 4.5 per cent of the administrators. These leaders were expected to explain the reasons for the decision and the objectives of the change to other community members. This procedure was used because it was known that the attitude of community leaders influenced the attitude of other individuals toward changes such as faculty desegregation. This procedure was used by 5.1 per cent of the administrators from small districts and 3.4 per cent of the administrators from large districts.

Three respondents reported that they talked with parents that would be directly affected by the desegregation of faculties; that is, parents whose children would be in the classes of Negro teachers. All of the administrators reporting the use of this procedure had assigned Negro teachers to elementary schools. Three other respondents prepared the community for faculty desegregation by placing Negro teachers in positions so that they would come in contact with white students and parents. Two of these administrators reported that Negro teachers were used as assistant coaches for integrated athletic teams. The third administrator said that the Negro teacher was used as a playground director during the summer prior to the initiation of faculty desegregation.

The preparation that had been done for student desegregation was considered adequate by 13.6 per cent of the respondents. Two respondents indicated that the actions of a ministerial association had been effective in preparing the community for student desegregation. Seven others indicated that human relations organizations had been active in preparing the community for student desegregation.

A large portion of the total group of administrators indicated that no procedures were used to prepare the community for the transition to desegregated faculties. Thirty-nine respondents, which made up 44.3 per cent of the sample, reported that no procedures were used. Many reasons were given for not utilizing preparation procedures. The following reasons were among those listed:

> Preparation procedures might have created opposition where none originally existed.
>
> * * *
>
> Our evaluation of the prevailing community climate led us to believe that the community was ready for the move without additional orientation.
>
> * * *
>
> We felt that if the move were made then the community would accept it.
>
> * * *
>
> If the teachers were placed before the parents were informed, we felt, then there would be less resistance to them [the Negro teachers]. If the Negro teachers were already in the schools and working effectively with the children then there would be no justification for resistance.

> Our Negro teacher was so well accepted that there was no need for any community preparation.

Analysis of the responses by the year that faculty desegregation was initiated revealed that 30.7 per cent of those administrators that did not use procedures for preparing the community had desegregated faculties prior to the 1960-1961 school year. Thus, 69.3 per cent of all administrators reporting no preparation initiated the process of faculty desegregation since the stated year. This suggests that as the status of the Negro changes progressively with the passage of time, communities become more favorable toward the transition to desegregated faculties. This over-all change in attitudes toward Negroes, no doubt, was influential in the decision of many administrators not to undertake any form of community preparation.

The data in Table 5 shows that there has been little active preparation of communities for faculty desegregation. Techniques that were specifically planned to prepare the community, or portions of it, for faculty desegregation were used by 38.7 per cent of the administrators. Over one-half (57.9 per cent) of the respondents made no specific preparations for faculty desegregation, either because of the adequacy of preparation for student desegregation, or because of the belief that the process would proceed just as smoothly without community preparation, or lack of knowledge of preparation techniques.

Student Preparation

Just as there may be attitudes held by individuals in a community who are resistant to faculty desegregation, there is also the possibility that students within a school may possess attitudes that would retard the process of faculty desegregation. It is reasonable to assume that some type of orientation of students for the change to desegregated faculties should result in a smoother transition. However, responses from administrators interviewed revealed that student orientation and preparation were not considered very essential to the acceptance of faculty desegregation. Fifty-six of the 88 respondents, which constituted 63.6

per cent of the total sample, reported that no preparation or orientation was provided for students. Many of the reasons given for not using preparation procedures for students were similar to those given for not using procedures to prepare communities.

Five administrators felt that the contact that Negro and white students had experienced with each other since student desegregation had served to prepare students for faculty desegregation. Students were aware of changing patterns of race relations and had not developed many of the attitudes of resistance to changes in social structure that were possessed by many of their parents; so reported 12 respondents. Other respondents gave various reasons for not using preparation procedures for students.

Talks by teachers to their homeroom classes was reported by 12.5 per cent of the respondents as the method used to prepare students for faculty desegregation. The same percentage of administrators said that preparation for students consisted of talks by the principal at special assemblies. A small percentage (4.5 per cent) of the respondents reported that the Negro teachers visited the schools prior to the desegregation of faculties. All administrators reporting this procedure were located in small districts.

Most of the procedures used to prepare students for the change were used by small districts. Only 13.7 per cent of the respondents from large districts reported preparation procedures for students, while 42.2 per cent of the respondents from small districts reported some form of student orientation for the change to desegregated faculties. This difference is probably related to the fact that most of the large districts are located in large urban centers where attitudes toward Negroes are more favorable and relationships are more impersonal.

Two administrators reported that students were shown films that emphasized the outstanding contributions of Negroes and that books dealing with the Negro's contribution to various fields were made available. Another respondent indicated that the student council held a student forum that was concerned with procedures that students could follow that would lead to harmonious relationships among Negro teachers and students.

The above discussion supports the observation that, though there has been some preparation of students for faculty desegregation, the majority of the administrators associated with desegregated faculties have not felt it necessary to use procedures to prepare students for the transition.

Teacher Preparation

Since the success of faculty desegregation is dependent to such a large extent on the teachers who are directly involved in the process it is desirable to know what types of procedures have been utilized in preparing them for the change. The attitude of teachers toward the transition can lead to pleasant and gratifying relationships or to hostilities that impair the educational program. The opportunities that teachers of different races have for contact and the extent to which they are aware of their responsibilities in the faculty desegregation process are thought to influence their attitudes toward the transition.

The procedures used to prepare teachers for faculty desegregation fall into two classifications— extended procedures and procedures immediately preceding the transition. The long-range procedures have been in operation for several years in some cases, in others, for a year or two prior to the change. Table 6 shows the types of preparation in each classification.

Biracial in-service meetings was given as a type of preparation by a large proportion of administrators from both small and large districts. The data showed 38.5 per cent of the administrators considered desegregated in-service meetings a form of teacher preparation. White teachers and Negro teachers who later became members of desegregated faculties were reported to have served together on professional committees by 19.3 per cent of the respondents. Several administrators reported that Negro teachers were appointed to committees such as textbook committees, curriculum revision committees, and committees dealing with special subject areas. Professional social affairs that were attended by Negro and white teachers served as a form of preparation for faculty desegregation; so stated 7.9 per cent of the subjects. All of the procedures mentioned in this paragraph provided an opportunity for Negro and white teachers to come together, talk, and become better acquainted. As a result of these activities many Negro teachers were well known when they entered desegregated faculties. They also knew many of the white teachers.

Several procedures were used by administrators as specific preparation for faculty desegregation. However, none of these procedures were used by large numbers of administrators. There also was not much variation in the percentage of large and small districts using the different procedures. The most widely used procedure included in this group was faculty discussions. Twenty-four principals reported that they discussed the change to desegregated faculties with their faculties. Teachers were told that the change was going to take place and that they were expected to cooperate. They were encouraged to ask questions and discuss any aspects of the change that concerned them. Three superintendents from small districts reported that they talked to the teachers in the district and encouraged them to help make the change to desegregated faculties a successful one. No superintendents from large districts reported the use of this procedure.

Conferences were held with Negro teachers that were entering desegregated faculties by 26.2 per cent of the principals and superintendents. The purposes of these conferences were (1) to assure the teachers of the full support of the administrators, (2) to acquaint the teachers with some problems that might arise, and (3) to suggest behaviors that would lead to success and acceptance. Two administrators reported that Negro and white teachers visited each others' schools prior to the desegregation of faculties. Three administrators invited Negro teachers to attend faculty meetings that were held prior to the initiation of faculty desegregation. One principal reported that an intergroup relations workshop was conducted for white teachers.

Table 6 shows that biracial in-service meetings and faculty discussions were used quite frequently as procedures to prepare teachers for faculty desegregation. No other procedure was used by at least one-fifth of the subjects. However,

TABLE 6

PROCEDURES REPORTED BY ADMINISTRATORS THAT SERVED TO PREPARE TEACHERS FOR FACULTY DESEGREGATION IN THIRTY-EIGHT SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN KENTUCKY

Procedure	Small Districts[a]		Large Districts		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Extended procedures						
Biracial in-service meetings held	23	39.0	11	37.9	34	38.5
Biracial professional committees formed	10	16.9	7	24.1	17	19.3
Biracial professional social affairs held	5	8.5	2	6.8	7	7.9
Immediate procedures						
Principal held faculty discussions	13	22.0	11	37.9	24	27.3
Superintendent talked with Negro teachers	10	16.9	3	10.3	13	14.8
Principal talked with Negro teachers	6	10.2	4	13.6	10	11.4
Superintendent talked with white teachers	3	5.1	1	1	3	3.4
Teachers exchanged visits	-	-	1	3.4	1	1.2
Negro teachers invited to faculty meetings	2	3.4	1	3.4	3	3.4
Intergroup relations workshop held	-	-	1	3.4	1	1.2
No preparation	12	20.4	5	17.2	17	19.3
No response	3	5.1	-	-	3	3.4

[a] There are no column totals because most administrators reported more than one procedure. Some mentioned as many as three procedures.

most administrators did use at least one procedure for preparing teachers for desegregated faculties. There were 17 administrators, which constituted 19.3 per cent of the respondents, who reported that no method was used to prepare teachers for faculty desegregation. These data suggest that most administrators have felt that some form of preparation of teachers would facilitate the process of faculty desegregation. These administrators have either used methods to prepare teachers for the transition or considered previous desegregated conditions as having adequately prepared teachers for service in desegregated faculties.

Plans for Handling Objections to Negro Teachers

It would be highly unrealistic to assume that the transition to desegregated faculties would not result in some dissidence on the part of some individuals. There are in most communities some individuals who will resist changes such as faculty desegregation. This is especially true of communities that are located in a border state. Administrators, in evaluating community readiness, gain valuable information about the prevailing attitude of a community toward the desegregation of faculties. They are able to determine areas from which resistance and rejection of Negro teachers are most likely to come. This knowledge of the community background and community customs and traditions often makes it possible for leaders to anticipate adverse reactions to a change, and make adjustments that will reduce or eliminate objections.

What plans have administrators made and used in handling objections to Negro teachers? In order to answer this question, the respondents were questioned concerning their plans and procedures for handling objections. An analysis of the responses showed that 75.0 per cent of the total group of respondents adopted procedures for handling objections to Negro teachers. The data revealed that 23.7 per cent of the respondents adopted policies which stated that there would be no transfers of students. The 20 administrators who used this procedure stated that they felt that the granting of one transfer from a Negro teacher's classroom would "open the floodgates to numerous demands." A larger percentage of administrators from large districts (27. 6 per cent) used this procedure than did administrators from small districts.

Requests for transfers were also handled by asking parents to let their children remain in the Negro teacher's classroom for a specified length of time. This procedure was used by 12. 5 per cent of the respondents. It is interesting to note that all administrators who used this method stated that not a single parent repeated the request for a transfer at the end of the specified period. Nine respondents, constituting 10. 2 per cent of the subjects, said that they planned on handling requests for transfers on an individual basis. These respondents said that all of the circumstances surrounding a request would be studied before a decision would be made. They were careful to point out that all decisions were to be in keeping with previously established policies relating to transfers.

Objections to Negro teachers that may have come forth were avoided by 11. 4 per cent of the subjects by placing Negro teachers in elective and rotating classes. The 7. 9 per cent of the respondents who placed Negro teachers in elective classes pointed out that students who did not wish to be supervised by a Negro teacher could avoid doing so by not registering for the electives taught by these teachers. This plan was used by 10. 1 per cent of the administrators from large districts. No respondents from large districts made a special effort to place Negro teachers in rotating classes. Four administrators from small districts departmentalized the upper elementary grades in order to forestall possible objections to students remaining in Negro teachers' classrooms for the total school day.

Five administrators reported that parents were notified prior to the placement of students in Negro teachers' classrooms. Only those children of parents who did not object were chosen to enter Negro teachers' classes. However, only two of the administrators received objections. Two objections were received by one administrator and three objections were received by the other.

Several other plans for avoiding possible objections to Negro teachers were listed by 11. 3 per cent of the respondents. Three principals reported that parents were asked to come to the school and make their objections in person. The principals stated that they planned on talking with the parents and trying to get them to change their minds. However, no parents came to the school. Two administrators selected the students that would be taught by Negro teachers. Students that came from middle and upper income families were placed in Negro teachers' classes because these families were thought to be less resistant to faculty desegregation. Three respondents said that they placed their children and the children of board members and other prominent leaders in the classes of Negro teachers. The purpose of this procedure, so reported the respondents, was to demonstrate that school officials and community leaders had confidence in the teachers, and thereby, reduce the number of objections from other individuals. Two other respondents reported that students were selected for the Negro teachers in a different manner. Arrangements were made so the first Negro teachers, who were males, taught only boys for the first year that they were a part of desegregated faculties.

The procedures listed above were all used in a few instances by administrators in attempting to place Negro teachers on desegregated faculties in a manner that would not bring objections from parents and other community members. There were many administrators who felt that no objections from parents and community would be forthcoming and, therefore, no plans were needed to handle objections. Thus, 25.0 per cent of the respondents had no plans. Nine of the 22 respondents in this group originally placed Negro teachers in non-teaching positions. This method of assigning teachers made it unnecessary for these school officials to develop plans for handling objections to Negro teachers (provided the placement of Negro teachers as librarians, assistant librarians, and so forth is not considered a method of handling objections). The data revealed that 28.8 per cent of the administrators from small districts and 17.2 per cent of the administrators from large districts did not have plans for handling objections to Negro teachers.

There is no outstanding predominance of any one plan for handling possible objections to Negro teachers. A policy that restricted the transfer of students within schools and districts was used more frequently than any other plan. Districts size seems to have little influence on plans for handling objections. However, a greater proportion of the administrators from small districts assigned Negro teachers to teaching positions that would not be as likely to bring forth objections. A greater proportion of administrators from large districts adopted "no transfer" policies and asked parents to try the Negro teachers for a specified time. None of the differences in proportions are very large, and all must be interpreted cautiously due to the small number of respondents reporting the utilization of these procedures.

Method of Choice of Negro Teachers

It is considered important that the first Negro teacher placed in a desegregated faculty have a successful experience if further faculty desegregation is to take place and be successful. The quality of work done and level of performance at which the Negro teacher operates will influence the attitude of the community and school officials toward the placement of additional Negro teachers. There are excellent Negro teachers and there are poor Negro teachers, just as there are excellent white teachers and poor white teachers. However, a Negro teacher that is not as competent as is desirable, who fails in a desegregated faculty, is regarded not as another teacher who was inadequate, but as a representative of Negro teachers in general. Thus, it is reasonable to expect some selection to take place in the assignment of Negro teachers to desegregated faculties.

Since the superintendent recommends all teachers to be transferred or employed in the State of Kentucky, the responses regarding the method of selection of Negro teachers were analyzed by school districts. The responses of superintendents, principals, and teachers from each district were used in determining the procedure followed in a particular district in selecting Negro teachers. Table 7 shows that in small districts and in county districts tenure status and present employment in the district were the primary criteria used in the selection of Negro teachers. In five of the 11 small districts reporting that all Negro

TABLE 7

METHOD OF SELECTION OF NEGRO TEACHERS THAT INITIATED FACULTY DESEGREGATION IN THIRTY-EIGHT SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN KENTUCKY

Method of Selection	Small Districts	Large Districts	County Districts	Indpt. Districts
All Negro teachers with continuing contracts	10	1	9	2
All Negro teachers in the school district	11	3	10	4
Negro teachers screened by superintendent and principal	7	6	5	8
Total	28	10	24	14

teachers were placed, the Negro teachers had continuing contracts. Thus, a total of 15 small districts have assigned all Negro teachers with continuing contracts. All Negro teachers had continuing contracts in the three large districts where all Negro teachers were assigned to desegregated faculties. Calculations from Table 7 revealed that 19 of the 38 districts, or 50.0 per cent of the districts used the tenure status of Negro teachers as the principal criterion for the selection of Negro teachers to desegregate faculties. In 19 of the 24 county districts and 6 of the 14 independent districts, Negro teachers were chosen either on the basis of continuing contract status or present employment in the district.

In 13 of the 38 districts which constitute 34.2 per cent of the total number of districts, the first Negro teachers that were assigned to desegregated faculties were screened by the superintendent and principal of the school whose faculty was to be desegregated. In two of these districts, the Negro teachers were screened from among those recommended by Negro principals. Superintendents and principals reported that the criteria used in selecting the Negro teachers were professional competency, ability to teach, general personality, and personal neatness.

Negro teachers with stable personalities, who were not quick to take offense, and who were careful in their dress and personal appearance were chosen to initiate the change to desegregated faculties. Teachers were chosen who would be able to withstand petty annoyances with racial overtones without striking back in a manner that would lead to disharmony.

Administrators in two districts considered the previous experiences of Negro teachers in making selections. In each of these districts, Negro teachers were chosen to initiate the process of faculty desegregation because of their previous experience in desegregated groups. The teacher chosen in one district had attended an integrated camp for a summer. The teacher chosen in the remaining district had worked with integrated church groups.

A larger proportion of large districts have actually selected Negro teachers for the faculty desegregation process. Table 7 shows that 25.0 per cent of the administrators from small districts and 60 per cent of the administrators from large districts selected teachers. A similar relationship exists between county districts and independent ones; 20.8 per cent of the county district administrators and 57.1 per cent of the independent district administrators actually selected Negro teachers. A part of the reason for this variation is that many small county districts have abolished Negro schools when faculties were desegregated. The few teachers serving in these schools were all assigned to desegregated faculties. On the other hand, many large districts desegregated faculties before the schools for Negroes were closed. This made it possible to select those Negro teachers that would initiate faculty desegregation.

Administrators from districts that carefully selected Negro teachers and administrators from districts that chose Negro teachers on other bases both reported much success with faculty desegregation. This fact justifies the observation that success in faculty desegregation does not depend to a great extent on the assignment of only highly screened, extremely competent Negro teachers to desegregated faculties. Good teachers from Negro faculties can be expected to be good teachers in desegregated faculties.

Plan for the Initial Assignment of Negro Teachers

Two questions were asked of the respondents in order to determine the initial plan for the assignment of Negro teachers and the reason for the choice of the plan. The data gathered from administrators made it possible to classify the initial assignment of Negro teachers into four categories— regular teacher, librarian, special teacher, and diversified.

Negro teachers were placed as regular classroom teachers in 21 school districts. In 10 districts, Negro teachers were employed as librarians. Negro teachers were assigned to a variety of positions in six school districts. The positions included were classroom teacher, librarian, special teacher, remedial reading teacher, and lunchroom supervisor. In one district, the Negro teacher served as a special teacher; that is, she served as an assistant librarian and taught remedial reading. Thus, in 55. 3 per cent of the districts included in this study, Negro teachers were assigned as regular classroom teachers. In 26. 3 per cent of the districts, Negro teachers were assigned as librarians. Negro teachers served in a variety of positions in 15. 8 per cent of the districts. In 2. 6 per cent of the districts, the Negro teacher served as a special teacher.

Nine small districts placed Negro teachers as librarians, while two large districts did so. A slightly greater proportion of the large districts (60. 0 per cent) assigned all Negro teachers to regular classrooms than did small districts (53. 6 per cent). One small district assigned the Negro teacher as a special teacher. As stated above, these were the plans for the initial placement of Negro teachers.

Some administrators that originally placed Negro teachers as librarians, or in other non-teaching positions, have reassigned these teachers to regular classroom positions.

There are usually underlying factors that operate in the decision to initiate faculty desegregation according to a particular plan of assignment of Negro teachers. Administrators who indicated that Negro teachers were placed in positions other than as regular classroom teachers were asked why they had made these assignments. Of the total group of 30 respondents, 53.3 per cent indicated that the method of assignment used was chosen because it was more acceptable to the community. There were no vacancies in the schools for additional classroom teachers; so reported 13.3 per cent of the respondents. The same percentage (13.3 per cent) said that the Negro teachers were quite old and were academically weak. A reason given by 6.4 per cent of the subjects was that the teachers were prepared for the area of need. These administrators indicated that librarians were needed. The Negro teachers were prepared; therefore, they were placed as librarians. One respondent reported that he felt that the Negro teacher needed time to get oriented before taking up duties as a regular classroom teacher.

Additional analysis of the data showed that 75.0 per cent of the replies stating that the method of assignment used was believed to be more acceptable to the community came from administrators in districts where Negro teachers had been assigned as librarians. These administrators were undoubtedly reluctant to initiate changes that they considered so drastic that the community might actively resist them. Five administrators were quite candid in their explanation of the reason for placing Negro teachers in non-regular positions. They said the Negro teachers had remained in small schools that were all but forgotten for many years. These teachers had not returned to school regularly for additional training, and the school officials had not suggested that they do so. These teachers were not prepared to assume regular teaching duties; so the administrators reported. Thus, the teachers were given library and other non-teaching assignments.

Some administrators placed Negro teachers in non-teaching positions as a transition step in the process of faculty desegregation. Negro teachers were to prove their capabilities in these positions, and then they would be placed as regular classroom teachers. Those administrators that were associated with desegregated faculties where the Negro teachers were serving in non-regular classroom positions were questioned concerning their plans for shifting Negro teachers to regular classroom positions. An analysis of the responses revealed that 43.3 per cent of the administrators did not plan on shifting the Negro teachers to regular classroom duties. Twenty per cent planned on shifting the teachers the following year, and 26.7 per cent planned on doing so over a period of years. However, only 13.3 per cent of those administrators who assigned Negro teachers to non-regular classroom positions actually shifted the teachers to regular classroom positions. The transition was not completed by most administrators who planned to do so. Several administrators reported that the Negro teachers did not want to change to regular classroom teaching once they had adjusted to librarian roles. Other respondents stated that if they had known that faculty desegregation would proceed as smoothly as it did they would have recommended that the Negro teachers be placed as regular classroom teachers at the initiation of the process of faculty desegregation.

The data shows that in over one-half of the districts included in this study, Negro teachers were initially placed as regular classroom teachers. A majority of the administrators who have not placed Negro teachers as classroom teachers have hesitated in most cases because of fear of community resistance, lack of confidence in the ability of Negro teachers, and a lack of teaching vacancies. Once teachers are placed in non-regular teaching positions, there is little change of position, though the change was originally intended.

Plans for the Assignment of Additional Negro Teachers

The future employment of Negro teachers in desegregated faculties depends on the attitude of school boards, superintendents, and principals toward hiring additional Negro teachers more than any other single factor. Once those teachers with continuing contracts have been assigned, there is no legal obligation for school officials to hire additional Negro teachers. Yet, if no additional Negro teachers are placed on desegregated faculties employment opportunities for Negro teachers will be limited to the large urban school districts that have schools with predominantly Negro enrollments.

The attitude of superintendents and principals toward the employment of additional Negro teachers is most crucial. Boards of education generally follow the recommendations of superintendents. The desires of principals are certainly considered in the assignment of teachers. However, the attitude of the superintendent is most important, for he is empowered by law to recommend the employment of additional personnel. There are various forces that can be brought into play in order to coerce superintendents to consider the employment of additional Negro teachers. But, if superintendents are not convinced that they should employ teachers on a non-discriminatory basis, various forms of coercion will only end in token desegregation of faculties.

In order to ascertain the outlook for the employment of additional Negro teachers in desegregated faculties, administrators were asked a question concerning the board of education's plans for hiring additional Negro teachers. (If the superintendent or principal did not make his position clear in answering the question concerning the board's attitude, then a second question was asked. This question was "What do you feel are the possibilities of additional Negro teachers being employed for desegregated faculties in this district?" From the two questions, the writer was able to ascertain the attitude of administrators toward the employment of additional Negro teachers. In the majority of the cases, the second question was unnecessary. Most administrators expressed their opinions unhesitatingly.)

Table 8 shows the results of an analysis of the responses classified by superintendents and principals. The responses have been grouped into five categories. The first two categories are made up of responses that were favorable toward the employment of additional Negro teachers for desegregated faculties. The third category is considered neutral. The last two categories contain responses that indicated a negative attitude toward the assignment of additional Negro teachers.

Table 8 shows that a greater proportion of the principals feel that Negro teachers will be hired on merit and qualifications. A greater proportion of superintendents were of the opinion that Negro teachers would be considered for hard-to-fill positions. Otherwise, there is no great variation in the percentage of

TABLE 8

ATTITUDE OF ADMINISTRATORS OF THIRTY-EIGHT SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN KENTUCKY TOWARD THE EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL NEGRO TEACHERS FOR DESEGREGATED FACULTIES

Response	Superintendents		Principals		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Negro teachers will be hired on merit and qualifications	9	23.7	21	42.0	30	34.1
Negro teachers will be hired if highly qualified	9	23.7	10	20.0	19	21.6
Applications will be considered	8	21.0	9	18.0	17	19.3
Application not likely to be considered	9	23.7	9	18.0	18	20.5
Application will be considered for hard-to-fill positions	3	7.9	1	2.0	4	4.5
Total	38	100.0	50	100.0	88	100.0

responses of superintendents and principals.

The responses from the first two categories were added in order to determine the total percentage of favorable responses. This tabulation showed that 47.4 per cent of the superintendents and 62.0 per cent of the principals are favorable toward the hiring of additional Negro teachers. Additional calculations revealed that 55.7 per cent of the total group of respondents are favorable toward the placement of additional Negro teachers on desegregated faculties.

Three principals reported to the writer that they would like to have additional Negro teachers in order to make their ratio of teachers approximately equal to the ratio of students. Several superintendents and principals reported that the excellent job that had been done by the Negro teachers had convinced them that additional Negro teachers could be placed without difficulty. The following statements of two superintendents are representative of many that were made:

> I would not hesitate to recommend several Negro teachers of the caliber of Miss X.

* * *

> Mr. Y has done such an excellent job that I feel additional Negro teachers could be placed in any school in this district without repercussions.

About one-fifth (19.3 per cent) of the respondents replied in a manner that did not indicate whether they felt that the outlook for the employment of additional Negro teachers was favorable or unfavorable. Most of these respondents made statements that applications would be considered. They gave no indication of whether they thought acceptable applicants would be employed.

Further analysis of the responses showed that 31.6 per cent of the superintendents did not anticipate the hiring of additional Negro teachers in the foreseeable future. Three superintendents did say that there was a possibility that Negro teachers would be hired for positions that are hard to fill. Several superintendents were quite frank in their statements regarding the employment of additional Negro teachers. They stated that the employment of additional Negro teachers that were not known in the district would not be accepted as readily as the placement of the local teachers. Several superintendents said that the hiring of additional Negro teachers would be viewed with alarm by many segments of the community who realized that school officials were obligated to place those teachers that were presently serving in the district. The following statements of superintendents are quoted in order to present more clearly the attitude of administrators toward the employment of additional Negro teachers.

> If the Negro and white applicants were equal in qualifications, I would probably recommend the white applicant. His placement would be less troublesome. If the Negro applicant was clearly head and shoulders above the white applicant, then I'd recommend him.

* * *

> If I could be certain that the Negro applicant understood our situation, and if he were highly recommended, then I would consider his application.

* * *

> A Negro teacher that is a graduate of one of the predominantly white colleges would be considered for placement. I wouldn't hire a Negro teacher that had not had some experience in integrated situations.

Twenty per cent of the principals included in this study indicated that they felt that few additional Negro teachers would be hired for desegregated faculties. Thus, 25.0 per cent of all administrators in the sample feel that there will be little hiring of additional Negro teachers in their locations.

The responses concerning the hiring of additional Negro teachers also were classified by size and type of district. Analysis of the data in this manner revealed that 45.7 per cent of the administrators from small districts were optimistic about the employment of additional Negro teachers, while 75.9 per cent of the administrators from large districts expressed optimism. A larger proportion of administrators from small districts (28.9 per cent) than from large districts (17.2 per cent) felt that there would be little additional hiring of Negro teachers for desegregated faculties. Administrators from independent districts were more favorable in their outlook toward the hiring of additional Negro teachers than those from county districts. Calculations showed that 48.1 per cent of the administrators from county districts were favorable in their outlook toward the hiring of additional Negro teachers. Sixty-five per cent of the administrators from independent districts were favorable in their outlook.

No administrators indicated that they felt that additional Negro teachers would be placed in elementary schools but not in secondary schools, or that additional Negro teachers would be placed in secondary schools but not in elementary ones.

The above data indicate that the majority of the administrators associated with desegregated faculties will hire additional Negro teachers for desegregated faculties. It appears that Negro teachers must have above average qualifications in order to be considered for positions on desegregated faculties. The supply and demand for teachers in certain fields, such as physics, chemistry, and mathematics, will lead to additional Negro teachers being assigned to desegregated faculties.

The statements made above are supported by the fact that additional Negro teachers were assigned to desegregated faculties in seven of the 38 districts that are included in this study. Administrators from four small districts and three large districts reported that additional Negro teachers have been assigned to desegregated faculties. Only 10 superintendents reported that applications had been received from Negroes for teaching positions. Thus, it is possible that more Negro teachers would be placed in desegregated faculties if more applications were filed in more school districts. Negro teachers have apparently assumed that they would not be hired in many of the smaller districts and, therefore, have not filed applications. Another reason why Negro teachers may be reluctant to file applications for positions in desegregated faculties is the lack of clear policy statements that would encourage Negro teachers to file applications.

Statement of Policy

Many teachers and other individuals are concerned with the official position taken by school leaders in the transition to desegregated faculties. Teachers who are anxious about their continued employment are relieved when there is a definite policy established by school officials relating to employment opportunities. Negro teachers will not be as hesitant in applying for teaching positions when there are official policies stating that teachers will be hired on qualifications. A statement of policy serves to let others know that school officials have taken a definite stand and are united in their support of faculty desegregation. Policy statements serve to bring together divergent parts of official bodies, for once a policy is established it becomes the responsibility of all members to support the stated policy.

There was a noticeable lack of statements of policy by school officials in the transition to desegregated faculties in the districts included in this study.

Only 12.5 per cent of the administrators interviewed indicated that some type of statement relating to policy was formulated. Four administrators from two districts reported that school officials adopted a policy which stated that all teachers would be employed and assigned to schools on the basis of qualifications and the needs of the school district. Three superintendents reported that a policy statement was issued by the board of education and superintendent explaining the requirements of the tenure laws and stating that all teachers would be placed in the transition to desegregated faculties. Four administrators from two additional districts said that policy statements were issued which stated that all teachers in the districts would be retained and assigned to the areas of greatest need.

The small number of respondents who stated that policy statements were formulated indicates that school officials have not deemed it necessary to formulate policies relating to the employment and placement of teachers without regard to race. The absence of such a statement, however, does not necessarily indicate that Negro teachers without continuing contracts are going to be dismissed, or that additional Negro teachers will not be employed. Several of the districts that have hired additional Negro teachers have not adopted policies relating to the employment of teachers without regard to color.

Many administrators who reported that no policy statement was formulated said that the change to desegregated faculties was made as quietly and as routinely as possible. They felt that a policy statement would have directed attention to the change which was not desired.

Evaluation of Preparation Procedures

The effectiveness of preparation procedures can be gained from administrators' opinions of the preparation procedures that were utilized by them in initiating the change to desegregated faculties. In order to determine how administrators evaluated the preparation that was made for faculty desegregation, the following question was asked: "What changes would you make in your preparation for faculty desegregation if you had to do it all over again?"

The responses that were given to this question were surprising. Only four of the administrators indicated that they would make changes in their preparation for faculty desegregation. Two administrators reported that they would give more attention to the preparation of white teachers for the transition.The remaining two administrators said they would use more techniques to get the people in the lower socio-economic groups to acccept the assignment of Negro teachers to formerly all-white faculties.

Two similar questions were asked of the respondents in order to determine if there were procedures in any phase of the faculty desegregation process that would be omitted that were used, or would be used that were omitted, if the process were started all over again.

Five respondents indicated that a change would be made in procedures. Two superintendents said that they would probably retain all Negro teachers who were employed in the district. Two principals said that they would recommend that Negro teachers be placed in the classroom as regular teachers. One superintendent indicated that he would recommend the desegregation of faculties and students simultaneously. This low number of administrators who reported that variations would be made in procedures utilized in desegregating faculties indicate that the procedures followed in desegregating faculties were considered quite adequate to effect a successful transition.

To determine more precisely how administrators evaluated the overall transition to desegregated faculties, the following question was asked: "In general, would you say that faculty desegregation in your school (district) has been successful?"[1]

Many administrators replied that the transition was extremely successful in that no problems had developed. Others reported that the process was accompanied by some minor problems, but the transition was still considered very successful. Several other administrators reported that there was some resistance to the transition and that some problems had developed, but the change was still considered successful.

---

[1] The word "district" was used in interviews with superintendents.

On the basis of variations in responses, such as those cited above, the data were grouped into three categories: extremely successful, very successful, and moderately successful.

Table 9 shows that 67.8 per cent of the administrators from small districts reported that the transition had been extremely successful, while 82.8 per cent of the administrators from large districts reported extreme success.

The change to desegregated faculties was considered very successful by 25.4 per cent of the administrators from small districts, and by 13.8 per cent of the administrators from large districts. Few administrators from either large or small districts considered that the transition to desegregated faculties had met with moderate success. Administrators from large districts have had fewer problems that were related to faculty desegregation, and, therefore, reported a slightly higher degree of success. The high percentage of the total group of respondents (72.7 per cent) reporting that the transition to desegregated faculties was extremely successful leaves no doubt that Negro and white teachers can work together in meeting the needs of students.

The data regarding the degree of success was classified by the use of preparation procedures in order to determine if any relationship existed between the use of preparation procedures and the degree of success with faculty desegregation. Table 10 shows that there is very little relationship between administrators' evaluation of the success in the desegregation of faculties and preparation.[2] A slightly higher percentage of those administrators reporting some type of preparation said that the transition had been extremely successful. The data shows that 73.2 per cent of the respondents who used some type of preparation procedures said that the transition to desegregated faculties was

---

[2] This lack of relationship may be due to a pre-existing favorable community climate in many communities where no preparation procedures were used.

TABLE 9

ADMINISTRATORS' EVALUATION OF THE DEGREE OF SUCCESS OF FACULTY DESEGREGATION IN THIRTY-EIGHT SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN KENTUCKY

Response	Small Districts		Large Districts		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Extremely successful	40	67.8	24	82.8	64	72.7
Very successful	15	25.4	4	13.8	19	21.6
Moderately successful	4	6.8	1	3.4	5	5.7
Total	59	100.0	29	100.0	88	100.0

extremely successful, while 69.0 per cent of those who did no preparing reported that their programs were extremely successful.

Table 10 reveals that 19.6 per cent of the administrators who reported some type of preparation evaluated the change to desegregated faculties as very successful, while 27.6 per cent who reported no preparation evaluated the change as very successful. The trend reversed again for those reporting average success as is indicated by 7.1 per cent of the respondents reporting some preparation and 3.1 per cent reporting no preparation. These data show that the utilization of preparation procedures is not closely associated with the degree of success with faculty desegregation as evaluated by administrators. However, a greater proportion of the respondents who reported that the transition was very successful did not utilize any preparation procedures. This fact becomes insignificant, though, when it is recalled that 69.0 per cent of the respondents who did not make any preparations reported that the change to desegregated faculties has been extremely successful. The reported success of the transition to desegregated faculties is substantiated by the low number of requests for transfers from Negro teachers' classes, and from schools with desegregated faculties. As was expected, no respondent reported requests for transfers from parents or students in schools where Negro teachers were used as librarians or in positions that called for little formal contact between the Negro teacher and students.

TABLE 10

THE RELATIONSHIP OF ADMINISTRATORS'EVALUATION OF SUCCESS WITH FACULTY DESEGREGATION AND THE UTILIZATION OF PREPARATION PROCEDURES

Response	Preparation Procedures Used	
	Yes	No
Extremely successful[a]		
Number	41	20
Per cent	73.2	69.0
Very successful		
Number	11	8
Per cent	19.6	27.6
Moderately successful		
Number	4	1
Per cent	7.1	3.4

[a] Does not include three respondents who reported that the transition to desegregated faculties has been extremely successful but did not know about the preparation procedures.

Only those respondents who reported specific methods of preparing teachers are included in the "yes" column.

It is generally assumed that faculty desegregation will be resisted more at the elementary level than at the secondary level. In order to determine if this were true, the responses regarding requests for transfers were classified into two categories—those received by elementary principals and those received by secondary principals. Thirteen of the 31 elementary principals received at least one request for a transfer. Six of the 19 secondary principals received at least one transfer request. Additional analysis showed that 41.9 per cent of the elementary principals and 31.5 per cent of the secondary principals received requests for transfers. There were more requests per principal at the secondary level than at the elementary level. Two elementary principals reported five or more requests. The mean number of requests received by elementary principals was 2.5. The mean number of requests received by secondary principals was 6.0. This wide variation is due to one secondary principal receiving 30 requests for transfers. If the number of requests received by this principal are eliminated, then the mean number of requests received by secondary principals becomes 3.6.

The principal who reported 30 requests for transfers headed a desegregated faculty that had an all-white student body. The school was located in an all-white neighborhood. No effort had been made to prepare the students and community for the transition to a desegregated faculty.

Only two principals, one elementary and one secondary, reported that they received requests for transfers during the second year of faculty desegregation. The elementary principal received two requests; the secondary principal received one request.

From the above data, it appears that there is no greater resistance to faculty desegregation at the elementary level than there is at the secondary level, if the number of requests for transfers from Negro teachers' classes is used as a measure of resistance. Though a greater percentage of elementary principals reported requests for transfers, a larger number of requests were reported by secondary principals. The low number of requests for transfers by parents becomes more meaningful when it is recalled that approximately 60,000 students who represent at least 40,000 parents are associated with schools that have desegregated faculties. Of this number of parents, only 83 have resisted faculty desegregation to the point of requesting transfers of students from the classes of Negro teachers. When the number of requests for transfers is considered as a criterion of success in the process of faculty desegregation, then it becomes apparent that the evaluations of administrators of the success of the transition are quite accurate.

Techniques Utilized in the Desegregation of Faculties

The smoothness with which faculty desegregation is accomplished is thought to be related to the techniques that are used in making the transition. Thus, administrators were asked to list those techniques that they considered most useful in desegregating faculties. The techniques listed are summarized in Table 11. This table shows that the technique mentioned most often was "Make the change as quietly and as routinely as possible." This technique was mentioned by 25.0 per cent of the respondents. The second-ranking technique mentioned by 23.9 per cent of the respondents, was "Inform the community of objectives and plans." It appears that two opposing techniques rank first and second in the frequency of mention of techniques utilized. Those administrators who made the transition quietly and routinely experienced success and, thus, considered making the change quietly and routinely a valuable technique. On the other hand, those administrators who informed the community of objectives and plans experienced success also and, thus, considered this technique a useful one.

The selection of superior Negro teachers to initiate the change to desegregated faculties and the use of talks to insure faculty acceptance were mentioned by 19.3 per cent of the respondents. These two techniques tied for ranks three and four in frequency of mention. Seventeen per cent of the respondents felt that a good technique was to start the process of faculty desegregation with experienced local Negro teachers. The same percentage of respondents said that firm commitments on the part of administrators was a useful technique. (This is not actually a technique, but since it was mentioned by a sizeable portion of the subjects, it is included.)

An informal survey of community attitudes toward the transition to

TABLE 11

NUMBER AND RANK OF TECHNIQUES LISTED BY ADMINISTRATORS AS BEING MOST USEFUL IN PREPARING FOR FACULTY DESEGREGATION IN THIRTY-EIGHT SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN KENTUCKY

Technique	Frequency	Rank	Per Cent
Make the change as quietly and as routinely as possible	22	1	25.0
Inform the community of objectives and plans	21	2	23.9
Select superior teachers to initiate the change	17	3.5	19.3
Use talks to insure faculty acceptance	17	3.5	19.3
Begin with local experienced teachers	15	5.5	17.0
Indicate firm commitment and do not equivocate	15	5.5	17.0
Survey community attitudes informally	12	7	13.6
Place Negro teachers in schools that have Negro students	9	8	10.2
Place first Negro teachers as librarians	8	9.5	9.1
Adopt a policy of no transfer of students	8	9.5	9.1
Use a biracial citizens committee to make recommendations	7	11	8.0
Assign Negro teachers to classes with middle class students	6	12.5	6.8
Provide opportunities for teachers to become acquainted	6	12.5	6.8
Place Negro teachers in elective or rotating classes	5	14.5	5.7
Let student desegregation precede faculty desegregation	5	14.5	5.7
Secure the cooperation of news media	3	16	3.4
Announce the change prior to initiation	2	17	2.3

desegregated faculties ranked seventh in frequency of mention by the respondents. This technique was considered useful by 13.6 per cent of the respondents. It was used by 23.9 per cent of the respondents (see Table 4, page 90). The lower percentage of respondents who felt that this technique was useful indicates that many who used it did not consider it very valuable. The eighth-ranking technique, "Place Negro teachers in schools that have Negro students," was mentioned by 10.2 per cent of the respondents. All lower-ranking techniques were mentioned by less than 10 per cent of the respondents.

Few administrators mentioned that the securing of the cooperation of the news media was a useful technique. Only 3.4 per cent of the respondents mentioned this technique.[3] No administrator mentioned any technique that involved social organizations or the parent-teacher association. The writer was surprised to find that no administrator mentioned the involvement of these organizations as useful techniques in preparing for faculty desegregation. It is surmised that the use of these organizations in preparing for faculty desegregation would create more fanfare and publicity than most administrators deem desirable; therefore, they were not mentioned.

Table 11 shows that many of the techniques listed by administrators are related to the choice and placement of Negro teachers. Other techniques relate mainly to the establishment and use of channels of communication between administrators and teachers, and administrators and the community.

Community Conditions that Facilitated the Change to Desegregated Faculties

Some of the success reported by administrators in the transition to desegregated faculties can undoubtedly be accounted for by conditions in the community that helped create a favorable climate for faculty desegregation. An inquiry into the community conditions that have facilitated the change affords an opportunity to determine those community conditions which are indicative of a favorable climate for faculty desegregation. Respondents were asked the question, "In your opinion, what conditions in the community made the change possible?" Several of the respondents gave three or four conditions that they felt made the change possible. Others gave only one or two conditions. The range was from one to six conditions. In many cases, the community conditions had to be gleaned from general statements made by the respondents. Seventeen different community conditions were perceived by the respondents to have made the change to desegregated faculties possible.

---

[3] About a third of the administrators had previously mentioned that news media should be kept as quiet as possible.

Table 12 reveals that many administrators cited "Negroes in the community were highly respected" as a condition that made the change possible. Several comments of the following types were made:

> The Negroes in this community have lived here longer than most whites. They are honest, industrious people that are respected by practically everyone. Most people were happy to have the Negro teacher and students.

* * *

> The Negroes in our community have proved that they are solid citizens. They cooperate in civic ventures and contribute to the progress of the community just as does everyone else. They carry themselves in such a manner that they are fully accepted.

The community conditions mentioned most frequently by administrators from small districts are not the ones mentioned most frequently by administrators from large districts. Only one condition that ranks among the first six listed by administrators from small districts also ranks among the first six listed by administrators from large districts. The conditions that rank highest in terms of frequency of mention by administrators from small districts are closely related to the size of the community. For example, Negro teachers would be much less well known in a large metropolitan community than in a small community. The data supports this contention in that 33.9 per cent of the small-district administrators reported "Negro teachers were well known" as a facilitating condition. Only 3.4 per cent of the large-district administrators reported this condition as a facilitating one.

The condition listed most frequently by small-district administrators was "small percentage of Negroes in the community." This condition was listed by 39.1 per cent of the small-district administrators. Administrators in districts where the proportion of Negroes was small stated that there was little bias and few hostile feelings toward Negroes. The communities did not perceive the presence of Negroes as threatening in any way. Thus, discrimination had not been practiced to a great extent. The small number of Negro students and teachers were hardly noticeable once they were placed in the predominantly white schools; so reported many administrators. The communities had accepted the few Negroes present, while larger numbers would have been perceived as more threatening and would have possibly led to greater resistance to faculty desegregation.

Many small-district administrators (37.3 per cent) reported that community citizens felt that faculty desegregation was inevitable due to court decisions, and had acquiesced to a changing social order. The general feeling was that faculty desegregation was coming, and that it was better to go ahead and begin the transition before being forced to do so.

Over one fourth (27.1 per cent) of the small-district administrators felt that the confidence that the community had in the decision-making ability of the school officials led to acceptance of the change to desegregated faculties. These respondents explained that the community had always supported school officials in initiating changes. These changes had resulted in an improved program of education. Consequently, the community had much faith in the decisions and plans made by the school officials. This belief on the part of the community that the school leaders would choose a course of action that would best meet the needs of the pupils helped make it possible to desegregate faculties with little resistance and turmoil.

Table 12 shows that integrated athletic teams have helped create community conditions that are favorable toward faculty desegregation to a considerable extent in small districts. Twenty-two per cent of the small-district administrators reported that communities were highly pleased with the success in sports that had resulted from the integration of athletic teams. The high regard for the athletic ability of Negro players, and the acceptance of them as a part of the team helped create a favorable climate for faculty desegregation.

A different group of conditions was mentioned most frequently by large-district administrators. The community condition mentioned most frequently by large-district administrators was the firm favorable attitude of community leaders. Of these administrators, 34.5 per cent reported that community leaders had a favorable attitude toward faculty desegregation. When other community members realized that the leading citizens were in favor of the transition there was little opposition. The second highest ranking condition in terms of frequency of mention by large-district administrators was the relatively high economic and educational level of the majority of the community. This condition was mentioned by 31.0 per cent of the large-district administrators.

The third ranking community condition mentioned by large-district administrators was satisfaction with student desegregation. This condition was mentioned by 27.6 per cent of the administrators from large districts. These administrators felt that the smoothness with which student desegregation had been accomplished was highly pleasing, and served to create favorable attitudes toward faculty desegregation. The community condition that ranked fourth in frequency of mention by large-district administrators was "mixed residential area." Seven administrators from large districts indicated that Negroes and whites lived in integrated communities. They had grown to accept each other and did not resent the assignment of Negro teachers to desegregated faculties.

Two community conditions that made the transition to desegregated faculties possible were mentioned by the same number of respondents, and therefore, occupied the fifth and sixth ranks in terms of frequency of mention by large-district administrators. The presence of organizations in the community that promoted good human relations was reported by 20.7 per cent of the respondents from large districts. This same percentage indicated that a facilitating condition was that Negroes in the community were highly respected.

Table 12 also shows the conditions that were mentioned by the total group of respondents. A condition that was not among the top six in frequency of mention by either small- or large-district administrators, yet ranks high in total frequency of mention, was the existence of open channels of communication. Sixteen respondents (18.1 per cent) reported that the existence of channels through which Negroes and whites could exchange ideas, plans, and information had made it possible to make the transition to desegregated faculties with little misunderstanding.

Good relations between whites and Negroes prior to the desegregation of faculties was mentioned by fourteen respondents. One respondent said that Negro and white students had ridden on the same school bus for 25 years prior to the desegregation of faculties and students. Another reported that Negroes and whites had attended the same church for many years. These and other activities had led to much contact and understanding between the races.

Several other community conditions that facilitated the change to desegregated faculties were mentioned by a small number of the total group of respondents. One-eighth of the administrators reported that the knowledge of the high qualifications of Negro teachers was partially responsible for the lack of resistance to faculty desegregation. The favorable attitude of civic and professional organizations helped create a favorable climate for faculty desegregation; so reported 10.2 per cent of the administrators. Several administrators felt that awareness of the dilapidated state of Negro schools was partially responsible for the community accepting the change to desegregated faculties with little resistance. This condition was mentioned by nine respondents.

Very few administrators mentioned the moral consciousness and

TABLE 12

NUMBER AND RANK OF COMMUNITY CONDITIONS LISTED BY ADMINISTRATORS THAT FACILITATED THE CHANGE TO DESEGREGATED FACULTIES IN THIRTY-EIGHT SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN KENTUCKY

Condition	Small Districts			Large Districts			Total		
	No.	Rank	Pct.	No.	Rank	Pct.	No.	Rank	Pct.
Negroes in the community were highly respected	21	3	35.4	6	5.5	20.7	27	1	30.7
Small percentage of Negroes in the community	23	1	39.1	3	14	10.3	26	2	29.5
Realization of the inevitability of faculty desegregation	22	2	37.3	3	14	10.3	25	3	28.4
Negro teachers were well known	20	4	33.9	1	17	3.4	21	4	23.9
Relatively high economic and educational level	10	9	16.9	9	2	31.0	19	6	21.6
Firm favorable attitude of community leaders	8	11	13.6	10	1	34.5	18	7.5	20.5
Pride in integrated athletic teams	13	6	22.8	5	7.5	17.3	18	7.5	20.5
Open channels of communication between races	12	7	20.4	4	10.5	13.8	16	9	18.1
Satisfaction with student desegregation	8	11	13.6	8	3	27.6	15	10	17.0
Presence of organizations promoting good human relations	8	11	13.6	6	5.5	20.7	14	11.5	15.9
Prior good relations between races	11	8	18.6	3	14	10.3	14	11.5	15.9
Confidence in school administrators	16	5	27.1	4	10.5	13.8	20	5	22.7
Racially mixed residential area	4	16	6.8	7	4	24.1	11	13	12.5
Awareness of inadequacy of Negro schools	6	13	10.2	4	10.5	13.8	10	14	11.4
Favorable attitude of civic and professional organizations	5	14	8.5	4	10.5	13.8	9	15.5	10.2
Negro teachers were known to be highly qualified	4	16	6.8	5	7.5	17.3	9	15.5	10.2
High moral consciousness and Christian character of the majority of the community	4	16	6.8	2	16	6.9	6	17	6.8

Christian character of the majority of the community as a condition that made the change to desegregated faculties possible. This condition was listed by six administrators, which constituted 6.8 per cent of the subjects.

The above data reveals that many varied community conditions have made the change to desegregated faculties possible. The community conditions listed most frequently are ones that relate to the status and number of Negroes in the community. Other frequently mentioned conditions were related to the attitudes taken by community and school leaders. It appears that where there are good relations between whites and Negroes on an equalitarian basis, and school and community leaders have the confidence of community citizens, faculty desegregation can take place with little turmoil and resistance.

Factors that Retarded the Transition to Desegregated Faculties

It is reasonable to expect that there will be some factors that will operate to retard the process of faculty desegregation. In order to determine the nature and extent of factors that retarded the process of faculty desegregation, administrators were asked to identify those factors that worked against the change.

Only a small proportion of the respondents reported factors that retarded the change to desegregated faculties. Thirteen administrators from small districts (22.0 per cent) stated that prejudiced white persons from the lower socio-economic level resisted the change. Three administrators from large districts (10.3 per cent) reported that this factor was operative. The opposition from these individuals consisted of requests for transfer of students and undercover rumblings of discontent that never formalized into overt resistant acts. One administrator found it necessary to write a letter to all parents in a low socio-economic level community explaining why the change had been made and indicating that school officials were determined to support the change. The resistance and threats ceased after the letter was delivered to the parents. Another administrator said that teachers were receiving uncomplimentary threatening letters from some parents. Upon determining who the parents were, he went to their homes and talked with them. The administrator reported that no more letters were received after his visit. These two cases are given as examples of the kinds of problems that have worked against the change to desegregated faculties.

Agitation by Civil Rights demonstrators was given as a retarding factor by one administrator. The respondent said that demonstrations had aroused hostile feelings in many citizens that led to a delay by school officials in the initiation of faculty desegregation.

Five other retarding factors were mentioned by administrators. They were: (1) some prejudiced board members, (2) some narrow-minded teachers, (3) some resistant parent-teacher association leaders, (4) southerners who had recently moved into the community, and (5) Negro parents who complained that Negro teachers were unfair to Negro students.

Thus, 22 of the 88 administrators reported factors that worked against the change. Sixty-six, or 75.0 per cent of the total number of administrators, stated that there were no factors that worked against the change to desegregated faculties. The number of administrators reporting resistance from members of low socio-economic groups suggests that particular attention should be given to these groups in making preparation for faculty desegregation. Members of groups that have low income and low education are more likely to perceive faculty desegregation as threatening, either to their job security, or to their social status.[4] Many of these individuals are hostile because they feel that they are neglected. Others are seeking someone for some situation that they can blame for their own shortcomings. Individuals from low income and low education groups are usually less aware of national and international developments. Their frame of reference is so narrow that they cannot adjust to social changes that are as sweeping as faculty desegregation without some dissidence. Often, it is these individuals within the community that are most in need of orientation or re-education for the transition to desegregated faculties. The other isolated cases of retarding factors indicate that there are other classes of individuals that should be considered in making preparations for faculty desegregation.

---

[4] Tumin, op. cit., p. 81.

The data revealed that many administrators have used many different approaches under many different community conditions in developing plans and initiating faculty desegregation. All of the plans have resulted in success in the process of faculty desegregation, as judged by administrators, though there have been some problems that have had to be overcome.

CHAPTER VI

QUALIFICATIONS, ASSIGNMENTS, PERCEPTIONS, AND SATISFACTION OF TEACHERS ASSIGNED TO DESEGREGATED FACULTIES

The data in this chapter are the responses of teachers assigned to desegregated faculties in 38 school districts in Kentucky during 1963-1964. The data were collected by interviewing 315 teachers in these school districts. Interviews were conducted with 180 Negro teachers and 135 white teachers. In most cases, the data have been classified according to the race of the teachers. Other classifications are used when they are deemed necessary to bring forth inherent meanings in the data.

Qualifications and Assignments

General Characteristics

This report of the general characteristics of teachers assigned to desegregated faculties reflects conditions as they existed at the time this study was made. The purpose of a study of certain characteristics is to reveal factors that are possibly related to adjustment to and facilitation of faculty desegregation. One of these characteristics is age.

The majority of the teachers interviewed for this study are quite mature in terms of age. Most of the teachers are over 40 years old. Of the 180 Negro teachers interviewed, 123 were 40 years old or older; of the 135 white teachers interviewed, 83 were 40 years old or older. The data revealed that 81, or 45.0 per cent of the Negro teachers are 50 years old or older, and that 58, or 43.0 per cent of the white teachers were 50 years old or older. The portion of white teachers under 40 years of age equaled 37.9 per cent, while the proportion of Negro teachers under 40 years of age equaled 33.1 per cent. The mean age of Negro teachers was 46.3 years, while the mean age of white teachers was 44.2 years.

Negro teachers included in this study are slightly older than white teachers. The higher mean age of Negro teachers is believed to result partially from administrators retaining those Negro teachers who are older and more experienced at the time reductions were made in the number of teachers.

TABLE 13

AGE OF 315 TEACHERS SERVING IN DESEGREGATED FACULTIES IN KENTUCKY CLASSIFIED BY RACE AND SEX

Age	Negro			White			Grand Total
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	
20-29	4	19	23	6	20	26	49
30-39	6	28	34	8	18	26	60
40-49	7	35	42	7	18	25	67
50-59	6	53	59	3	45	48	107
60-69	3	19	22	-	10	10	32
Total	26	154	180	24	111	135	315

Mean age of Negro teachers = 44.3 years
Mean age of white teachers = 44.2 years

Few Negro male teachers are assigned to desegregated faculties. Only 26 of the 180 Negro teachers interviewed were males. Only 24 white males were interviewed. However, many more white male teachers were assigned to positions in desegregated faculties of the schools visited. All of the Negro male teachers assigned to the faculties of schools visited are included in this study. Negro male teachers were assigned to elementary schools in only two school districts.

Most of the teachers were married and making their home in the districts where they worked. Of the total number of Negro teachers, 138 were married, 36 were single, 2 were divorced and 4 were widowed. In contrast, 23 white teachers were single, 104 were married, 2 were widowed, and one was divorced. The age and marital status of teachers serving in desegregated faculties are of such nature that these teachers should be able to make needed adjustments and restructure relationships readily. There are teachers who are old enough to have winnowed the best from past experiences, and teachers young enough to spread the changing interpretation placed on democracy and justice as they apply to the rights of individuals.

Professional Training

The amount of professional training that a teacher has is closely related to his efficiency as a teacher, or at least should be. In order to do an excellent job of teaching, a teacher must possess subject-matter knowledge and techniques of conveying this knowledge to pupils. Teachers who are well trained and are competent teachers can more readily gain respect and acceptance from parents, students and other teachers.

The majority of the teachers interviewed for this study have acquired extensive academic training. Table 14 shows that 6.1 per cent of the Negro teachers and 7.4 per cent of the white teachers have not received bachelor's degrees. The bachelor's degree level of training has been obtained by 53.3 per cent of the Negro teachers and 59.3 per cent of the white teachers. Negro teachers with master's degrees or over constitute 40.6 per cent of the Negro teachers, while white teachers with master's degrees or over constitute 33.3 per cent of that group of teachers. Thirty-three Negro teachers (18.4 per cent) and 16 white teachers (11.8 per cent) have 15 semester hours or more of training above the master's degree. Several teachers of both races reported that they had obtained enough semester hours of credit since receiving the bachelor's degree for a master's degree but had not followed a formal program leading to the master's degree.

Negro teachers have received slightly more academic training than their white counterparts included in the study. Both groups of teachers are well prepared for their teaching responsibilities in desegregated faculties. The few teachers who have not received bachelor's degrees have long years of experience and hold lifetime teaching certificates.

TABLE 14

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING OF 315 TEACHERS SERVING IN DESEGREGATED FACULTIES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN KENTUCKY

Level of Training	Negro		White		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Less than bachelor's degree	11	6.1	10	7.4	21	6.7
Bachelor's degree	96	53.3	80	59.3	176	55.9
Master's degree	40	22.2	29	21.5	69	21.9
Master's plus 15-23 semester hours	18	10.0	9	6.6	26	8.1
Master's plus 24 semester hours or over	15	8.4	7	5.2	23	7.4
Total	180	100.0	135	100.0	315	100.0

Most of the respondents have attended desegregated schools at some time in their lives. Eight Negro and seven white teachers received their elementary and secondary training at desegregated schools. These teachers quite obviously were from northern states. Sixteen white and 27 Negro teachers received their undergraduate training at segregated institutions.

Graduate training at biracial institutions was reported by 131 Negro teachers and 74 white teachers. At some point of their training, 144 Negro teachers and 90 white teachers attended desegregated schools. Of the total group of respondents, 234, or 74.3 per cent, have attended desegregated schools. Most of the teachers in this study have had previous contact with members of the opposite race in an educational setting that served as an aid in adjusting to faculty desegregation.

The analysis of additional data relating to training and most recent certification of Negro teachers showed that 61.6 per cent of these teachers are certified for elementary classroom teaching. The area of certification of 28.4 per cent was some phase of secondary education. Fourteen teachers (7.7 per cent) reported that they were certified as librarians. One teacher was certified as a guidance counselor, and three were certified in administration. These four teachers constituted 2.3 per cent of the total group.

Additional training was taken by 21 Negro teachers in order to become certified as librarians. This training has been completed by 14 teachers. Seven are presently taking courses during the summer. Four Negro teachers took courses in order to become certified as special education teachers. These teachers took courses because they desired to do so, rather than having to do so in order to be placed in desegregated faculties. Other than to become librarians, few Negro teachers have had to take additional training in order to become certified in the area in which they are serving.

Assignments of Negro Teachers

Negro teachers are serving in various capacities in desegregated faculties. Table 15 shows the general assignments of Negro teachers classified by district size. Many more Negro teachers have been utilized as librarians in small districts. Of the 25 Negro teachers serving as librarians, 22 are located in small districts. A large majority of the Negro teachers are serving in regular classroom positions in both large and small districts.

Of the total number of Negro subjects from small districts, 62.5 per cent were assigned to regular teaching positions. Regular teaching positions were held by 94.4 per cent of the Negro teachers in large districts. Two Negro teachers from small districts and one from a large district served as special teachers. These teachers had a variety of duties including teaching remedial reading, assisting the librarian, clerical work, and handling audio-visual aids. One Negro teacher in a large district and one in a small district were assigned as directors of pupil personnel. A Negro teacher serves as guidance counselor for both white and Negro students in one large district. One Negro teacher serves as assistant principal of a large elementary school in a small district.

TABLE 15

POSITIONS IN WHICH 180 NEGRO TEACHERS ARE SERVING IN DESEGREGATED FACULTIES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF KENTUCKY

Position	Small Districts			Large Districts			Total
	Elem.	JHS	SHS	Elem.	JHS	SHS	
Regular teacher	31	3	12	68	24	10	148
Librarian	19		3	2	1		25
Special teacher	2			1			3
Director of pupil personnel			1			1	2
Guidance counselor					1		1
Assistant principal	1						1
Total	53	3	16	71	26	11	180

Elem. = Elementary school
JHS = Junior high school
SHS = Senior high school

Table 16 shows a more detailed analysis of the assignments of Negro teachers. The prior assignments of Negro teachers are also listed in order to show the extent of change in the assignments of Negro teachers since they became members of desegregated faculties. Changes in assignments have been more prevalent among Negro elementary teachers than among Negro secondary teachers. Before entering desegregated faculties, 119 teachers were assigned as elementary classroom teachers. Elementary classroom teaching assignments are presently held by 99 teachers. The greatest increase in assignments is in the number of librarians, which showed a gain of 23. The gain of nine secondary teachers is made up mostly of principals who became secondary teachers. Three coaches were assigned positions as assistant coaches in desegregated faculties. One Negro band director became assistant band director.

TABLE 16

PRESENT AND PRIOR ASSIGNMENTS OF 180 NEGRO TEACHERS SERVING IN DESEGREGATED FACULTIES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF KENTUCKY

Position	Present	Prior	Change
Elementary teachers	99	119	-20
Secondary teachers	45	36	+ 9
Librarians	25	2	+23
Special teachers	3	-	+ 3
Coaches	3	3	-
Directors of pupil personnel	2	-	+ 2
Assistant principal/principal	1	8	- 7
Guidance counselor	1	-	+ 1
Band director	1	1	-
Not teaching	-	11	
Total	180	180	

In summary, 55.0 per cent of the Negro teachers are assigned as elementary classroom teachers; 25.0 per cent are assigned as secondary teachers; 13.8 per cent are assigned as librarians; 1.7 per cent as special teachers; 1.7 per cent are assigned as coaches; 1.1 per cent are assigned as directors of pupil personnel; and .6 per cent each as guidance counselor, band director, and assistant principal.

The majority of the Negro teachers are assigned to elementary schools. Since white teachers were interviewed from schools where Negro teachers were assigned, the majority of these teachers also were from elementary schools. There are 124 Negro teachers (68.7 per cent) serving at the elementary level. Junior high school assignments are held by 16.1 per cent of the Negro teachers. Fifteen per cent of the Negro teachers are assigned to senior high schools. The relative percentages for white teachers serving at the three levels are 60.8, 22.2, and 17.0, respectively. Reasons have already been given for this difference in the employment of Negro teachers at the elementary and secondary levels. Interviews with teachers revealed that an additional reason for fewer Negro secondary teachers being employed is that many of these teachers had not made their homes in the districts in which they were working. When the possibility of their being let out became imminent, many of these teachers voluntarily sought and received jobs in their home districts, or in other areas nearby.

Teachers who are members of desegregated faculties have many years of teaching experience. A large proportion of both Negro teachers (33.9 per cent) and white teachers (20.7 per cent) have over 20 years of teaching experience. Between 13 and 20 years of teaching experience is possessed by 26.1 per cent of the Negro teachers and 32.6 per cent of the white teachers. Negro teachers with 9 to 12 years of teaching experience made 17.2 per cent of the group, while 14.8 per cent of the white teachers had between 9 and 12 years of teaching experience. Less than a fourth of the Negro teachers (22.8 per cent) had eight or less years of experience.

The percentage of white teachers with eight or less years of experience equaled 31.9 per cent. The many years of teaching experience during which adjustments to many changing conditions had to be made have probably aided many teachers in making adjustments to faculty desegregation.

The greater mean number of years of teaching experience possessed by Negro teachers is partially accounted for by administrators retaining those Negro teachers who had been teaching in school districts for the greatest number of years. Younger Negro teachers, especially those who had not worked in districts long enough to receive continuing contracts, were let out in most cases when Negro schools were abolished. One teacher told the writer of a case where a young Negro teacher had worked in three different districts for three successive years. Each year as faculties were desegregated this teacher had to seek employment elsewhere because she had less experience than other teachers.

Several references have been made to the tenure status of teachers as a factor in the assignment of Negro teachers to desegregated faculties. In Chapter V, administrators from 50 per cent of the school districts indicated that the tenure status of Negro teachers was a major factor in the selection of teachers for desegregated faculties. The responses of Negro teachers regarding their tenure status supports the statements of administrators. Continuing contracts were held by 83.4 per cent of the 108 Negro teachers from large districts and 95.1 per cent of the 72 Negro teachers from small districts. Of the total group of 180 Negro teachers, 86.7 per cent had continuing contracts. Of the total group of 135 white teachers, 96, or 72.6 per cent possessed continuing contracts. These data show that while the majority of the Negro teachers have continuing contracts, a few teachers have been assigned to desegregated faculties who did not have continuing contracts. The tenure status of Negro teachers appears to have been more of a factor in the selection of teachers in small districts than in large ones.

Extra-Class Assignments and Positions of Teachers

Assignments and positions of teachers that bring them in contact with students, parents, and other teachers in a setting different from that of the classroom provides an opportunity for increased understanding and more rapid acceptance. The Negro teacher who directs a play or watches over students who are waiting for buses becomes better known in an informal manner. The same is true of teachers who are active in professional organizations and parent-teacher associations.

Interviews with teachers revealed that Negro teachers are assigned many varied duties in schools with desegregated faculties, just as are white teachers. Reports of teachers reveal that 63 Negro teachers are assigned periodically to supervise the lunchroom, playground and bus riders. Trips to athletic games and school dances are chaperoned by 11 Negro teachers. Clubs and organizations are sponsored by 25 teachers. Nineteen Negro teachers reported that they handled special drives and fund-raising projects. Nine Negro teachers serve as class advisors. A total of 127 Negro teachers and 96 white teachers reported that they had extra-classroom assignments. Thus, 70.6 per cent of the Negro teachers and 71.1 per cent of the white teachers had extra-classroom assignments. Teachers' perceptions of the effects of these extra-classroom assignments on acceptance will be reported in a subsequent section.

The fear has been repeatedly expressed that Negro teachers would lose their professional identity once Negro professional organizations were merged with white ones. It has also been generally conceded that Negro teachers who were assigned to desegregated faculties would lose the opportunity of professional leadership because there would be practically no opportunities for serving in leadership capacities. The election of Negro teachers to leadership positions not only provides an opportunity for high-level professional service but this action indicates that Negro teachers are accepted as professional colleagues at all levels, thereby leading others to accept them also.

Both Negro and white teachers were questioned concerning the positions held by them in the professional organizations and parent-teacher associations. Table 17 shows the positions that have been held by teachers since they have been assigned to desegregated faculties.

TABLE 17

POSITIONS HELD IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PARENT-TEACHER ASSOCIATIONS BY 103 TEACHERS OF DESEGREGATED FACULTIES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF KENTUCKY

Position	Negro			White		
	KEA	Local Assoc.	PTA	KEA	Local Assoc.	PTA
President	-	2	-	-	4	-
Treasurer	-	3	1	-	3	1
Secretary	1	3	1	-	2	3
Assistant secretary	-	5	1	-	-	-
Committee chairman	1	7	2	1	12	4
Committee member	1	8	3	2	10	5
Representative	1	10	-	1	6	-
Total	3	38	8	4	37	13

None of the white or Negro teachers have served as officers of the Kentucky Education Association. Three Negro teachers, or 1.7 per cent, have held positions in the Kentucky Education Association. Four white teachers have held similar positions. The two Negro teachers and four white teachers who have served as president of local branches of the Kentucky Education Association were first elected as vice-president. For this reason the position of vice-president was not listed. An inspection of Table 17 shows that 10 Negro teachers have served as officers of local education associations. One half of the teachers served as secretary or assistant secretary. Seven Negro teachers serve as committee chairmen, 8 as committee members, and 10 as representatives. Thus, 38, or 19.3 per cent, of the total group of Negro teachers held positions in local education associations.

Twice as many white teachers in the respondent group have served as president of local education associations. However, fewer white teachers have served as secretary and assistant secretary. Nine white teachers (6.7 per cent) served as officers of local education associations. The positions of committee chairman, committee member, and representative were held by 28 white teachers which constituted 35.9 per cent of the total number of white teachers interviewed. Thus, 37, or 31.6 per cent, of the white teachers held positions in local education associations.

Teachers served sparingly in leadership positions in parent-teacher associations. Many teachers stated that most of the parent-teacher association officers were parents. However, 8 Negro teachers and 13 white teachers held positions of leadership in parent-teacher associations. The 8 Negro teachers constitute 4.5 per cent of the Negro teachers, while the 13 white teachers constitute 8.9 per cent of the total group of white respondents.

The previous discussion shows that Negro teachers who have been assigned to desegregated faculties have not lost their professional identity. Though the Negro teachers included in this study have not served in leadership capacities in professional organizations to as great extent percentagewise as white teachers included in the study, they have had an opportunity to share in the planning and operation of professional organizations and parent-teacher associations. Many teachers reported that serving in these positions had brought them into close contact with other teachers, community leaders, and parents. The associations formed and common interests shared led to a deeper mutual respect and appreciation by members of both races.

Perceptions of Teachers Concerning Conditions in Desegregated Faculties

Most individuals view situations and conditions in terms of their own personal life, prior experiences, and biases. The perceptions of teachers are undoubtedly no less colored by their own biases and experiences, but they are still valuable, for teachers assigned to desegregated faculties act and react and relate to one another according to the way they perceive others and the total setting within which interaction takes place.

Teacher-Student Relations

A reason often given for the assignment of Negro teachers to schools with desegregated student bodies is so that Negro pupils will not feel as alone and alienated. The presence of Negro teachers on the faculty is thought to serve as a motivational factor for Negro students, as well as to give them a feeling of security. Negro students are thought to gain a sense of pride and identification when they know that Negro teachers are considered worthy of sharing in the high level training of youth.

The extent to which faculty desegregation is perceived as a successful venture depends greatly on the relationships that exist between students and teachers. These two groups are more closely related to the learning process than are any others. An indication of the kind of relationships that exist may be gained from a study of the interactions of teachers and students associated with schools that have desegregated faculties.

Teachers were questioned concerning the degree of student contact. Table 18 shows that Negro teachers reported that white students came to them to discuss topics of a general and personal nature almost as frequently as they came to white teachers. White teachers reporting that white students engaged them in general conversation very often, often, and sometimes equaled 68.9 per cent of the white group of respondents. The three categories were used by 63.9 per cent of the Negro teachers in reporting the extent of verbal contact initiated by white students. A larger percentage of Negro than white teachers used "very often" in reporting the degree to which white students initiated verbal contact. The desire to create a very favorable impression may have motivated some Negro teachers to become over-enthusiastic in reporting the extent of white student initiated verbal contact. However, the data clearly indicates that a majority of the Negro teachers as well as white ones are frequently engaged in general conversations by white students. White teachers are utilized to a slightly greater extent than are Negro teachers.

TABLE 18

EXTENT OF STUDENT INITIATED VERBAL CONTACT BETWEEN TEACHERS AND STUDENTS REPORTED BY 315 TEACHERS OF DESEGREGATED FACULTIES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF KENTUCKY

Response	White Students		Negro Students	
	White Teachers	Negro Teachers	White Teachers	Negro Teachers
Very often	4.4[a]	8.3	2.2	8.3
Often	21.5	14.5	17.8	15.6
Sometimes	43.0	41.1	28.9	34.5
Seldom	22.2	15.0	23.7	18.3
Never	7.4	17.2	25.9	18.3
No response	1.5	3.9	1.5	5.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[a] All numbers are percentages

Both Negro and white teachers indicated that Negro students come to them to discuss topics of a general and personal nature less frequently than do white students. Calculations from Table 18 show that 48.9 per cent of the white teachers reported that Negro students initiated verbal contact very often,

often, and sometimes. These three categories were used by 58.4 per cent of the Negro teachers in reporting the extent of Negro student initiated verbal contact. Negro teachers and white teachers are utilized by Negro students. However, Negro students used Negro teachers more frequently than white teachers for conversations of a general and personal nature. This evidence indicates that both Negro and white teachers are accepted by Negro and white students. Negro students apparently still feel a little less reluctant to come to Negro teachers for discussions. Many teachers indicated that the low number of Negro students in the school was the reason for the lack of Negro student initiated verbal contact.

The most surprising and significant findings that resulted from questioning teachers concerning student-teacher relations came as optional comments from 11 Negro teachers, four of which were in large districts and seven in small districts. These teachers, all of whom were assigned to secondary schools, reported that Negro students would have nothing to do with them. They said that the Negro students appeared to go out of their way to avoid talking to them. Two men teachers were very vehement in their statements. One said that he had taught and coached most of the Negro boys attending the school, yet they passed him and acted as if they did not know him. The other stated that the Negro students, especially the boys, acted as if they did not want him on the faculty. He said that "they express by their actions that they don't want to associate with anyone who is a Negro."

All of the teachers who mentioned that Negro students seemed to avoid talking with them appeared quite concerned about this avoidance. It is regrettable that Negro students in some cases have failed to accept Negro teachers on desegregated faculties. It appears that there is a need to prepare Negro students as well as other groups for the transition to desegregated faculties.

Negro teachers were questioned about the number of Negro students that had indicated an increased feeling of security with Negro teachers on the faculty. A few students were reported by 54 respondents to have indicated that they felt less alone and less alienated. Fifteen teachers reported several; four teachers reported a large number; three teachers reported many; and four teachers reported over 20. Seventy-six teachers reported that no students had stated that they felt less alone, but their actions indicated that they felt more secure. A total of 15 teachers reported with an unqualified "none." Nine teachers did not respond. Calculations show that 80 Negro teachers, or 44.4 per cent, have had indications from Negro students that they are pleased that Negro teachers are on the faculty.

Both Negro and white teachers were questioned about the change in discipline problems since faculties were desegregated. Five Negro teachers and six white ones reported more petty problems. More major problems were reported by three Negro teachers and four white teachers. Thus, 18, or 5.7 per cent, of both groups of teachers reported an increase in discipline problems since they began teaching in a desegregated faculty. An increase in major problems was perceived by only 2.2 per cent of the total group of respondents. Fewer petty problems were reported by 15 Negro teachers and 21 white teachers. Fewer major problems was the response of 7 Negro teachers and 6 white teachers. Thus, a total of 11.4 per cent of the respondents reported fewer petty problems, and 4.1 per cent reported fewer major problems. No change in discipline problems was reported by 78.8 per cent of the respondents. These teachers reported that they were fully accepted and treated as all other teachers.

Several white teachers reported that Negro students were more well-mannered than white students. Paradoxically, many Negro teachers said that white students were more well-mannered than Negro students. This difference in treatment is thought to be related to the fact that Negro students are more familiar with Negro teachers just as white students are more familiar with white teachers. Negro students and white students are probable less reluctant to behave in an offensive manner with teachers of another race for fear that this behavior will be given a racial interpretation.

Several of the white teachers who said that there were fewer discipline problems told the writer that Negro teachers were very helpful in handling problems involving Negro students. The Negro teachers knew the parents and family background in many cases, and were able to give information that provided a deeper insight into problems. Teachers also reported that in many cases white teachers had been extremely lenient with Negro students because they did not want to be accused of treating the students unfairly. Negro teachers were able to demand proper behavior from these students without being accused of racial prejudice.

The above findings suggest that most teachers who have entered desegregated faculties have not found student discipline to be a major problem. Teachers who are considering entering desegregated faculties need not fear that student discipline will be a major obstacle that must be overcome. Students have not taken advantage of teachers because of their newness on the faculty or because the teachers were of a different race; so reported teachers who were interviewed.

Many researchers have found that increased contact with members of a different ethnic group often serves to reduce fallacious ideas and bring about a greater readiness to participate and cooperate with members of that group. Increased contact leads to greater understanding between members of different races and a willingness to accept others in positions and roles that were hitherto unacceptable. It follows, then, that increased contact between Negro teachers and students can lead to greater acceptance of Negro teachers. The direction of extra-class activities by Negro teachers provides a form of contact between Negro teachers and students that can serve to increase acceptance of Negro teachers. However, the majority of the teachers interviewed stated that the direction of extra-class activities had not affected acceptance of Negro teachers by students, mainly because Negro teachers were fully accepted from the outset. Almost one half of the Negro teachers

(46.1 per cent) and white teachers (47.4 per cent) gave this opinion. The direction of extra-class activities was reported to have facilitated acceptance by 21.1 per cent of the Negro teachers; 16.1 per cent said that acceptance was facilitated "some, but not much." White teachers reporting that acceptance was facilitated much equaled 14.8 per cent; those reporting that acceptance was facilitated "some, but not much" equaled 16.3 per cent. A total of 37.2 per cent of the Negro teachers and 32.6 per cent of the white teachers felt that the direction of extra-curricular activities had facilitated the acceptance of Negro teachers.

Negro teachers gave examples of how the direction of extra-curricular activities had facilitated their acceptance. Two of these examples are shared here in order that the reader might comprehend the nature of the experiences that have led teachers to conclude that direction of extra-class activities facilitated acceptance.

One teacher, who handled a special dance group, said that students in the group became very attached to her and often brought other students in to meet her. In this way she became acquainted with many students whom she otherwise would not have met. She stated that when special apparel was needed parents would call her in order to be certain that they obtained exactly what she expected the students to have. The teacher said that her greatest surprise was when a group came up to her one PTA night and told her that they just wanted to thank her for taking so much time with their daughters.

Another teacher said that her work with students as Latin Club sponsor had resulted in many parents and students calling and talking with her who otherwise would not have done so. She reported that many students approached her about joining the club and spoke to her who had never done so before.

These statements and similar ones, plus the 34.6 per cent of the total group who indicated that direction of extra-class activities facilitated acceptance of Negro teachers, show that there is some value in assigning Negro teachers of desegregated faculties to extra-class activities. However, the 46.7 per cent of the respondents who perceived that student acceptance was full from the start suggest that other factors, such as administrator attitude, may be more important in gaining acceptance.

Parent-Teacher Relations

The kind of relationships that exist between teachers and parents of students attending schools with biracial faculties is indicative of the success achieved in the transition to desegregated faculties. Many administrators reported during interviews that they had hesitated to initiate the desegregation of faculties because they feared that parents would not accept Negro teachers. Since teachers are usually more closely associated with parents of their homeroom classes, they were questioned concerning their relationship with the parents of their homeroom classes. Teachers who were serving as librarians, counselors, and in other capacities which resulted in them not having homeroom classes make up the majority of the "no response" replies.

Table 19 shows the responses of teachers to three inquiries concerning their interaction with parents. The reports of both Negro and white teachers concerning the percentage of parents met by them ranged from no parents to 100 per cent of the parents. Though the percentages are low, a greater percentage of Negro teachers than white ones reported that they had not met any parents during the 1963-1964 school year. This response came from 2.2 per cent of the Negro teachers and 1.5 per cent of the white teachers. Calculations from Table 19 reveal that about one fourth of the Negro teachers stated that they had met between one and 40 per cent of the homeroom classes' parents, while 31.5 per cent of the white teachers estimated that between one and 40 per cent of the homeroom classes' parents had been met. Negro teachers reporting that they had met between 41 and 100 per cent of the homeroom classes' parents totaled 39.9 per cent. Negro teachers reported that they had met a mean of 53.3 per cent of the parents and white teachers a mean of 39.0 per cent of the parents. An unexpected finding was that a greater percentage of parents were reported to have been met by Negro teachers than by white teachers. The possibility exists that white teachers were unduly cautious in their estimates while Negro teachers were more liberal. A more plausible explanation is that parents sought out Negro teachers more often to assure these teachers of their support.

TABLE 19

EXTENT OF INTERACTION WITH HOMEROOM CLASSES' PARENTS REPORTED BY 315 TEACHERS OF DESEGREGATED FACULTIES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF KENTUCKY

Per Cent	Parents Personally Met		Parents Visited the School		Parents Homes Visited	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
None	2.2	1.5	4.4	5.2	31.7	54.1
1-20	10.0	22.2	13.9	29.6	28.3	22.2
21-40	14.4	19.4	15.0	22.2	2.8	3.7
41-60	13.9	17.0	20.0	14.1	5.6	.7
61-80	17.2	17.0	11.1	8.1	5.0	2.9
81-100	14.4	5.9	6.7	2.2	--	--
No response	27.9	17.0	28.9	18.6	26.6	16.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean	50.4	39.0	46.1	31.3	13.6	6.9

Statements from teachers support the above assumption. The following statements are typical of those made by Negro teachers.

> I met many parents when I would make trips to the grocery store or downtown. Students would come up to me and say "Mrs. _________, this is Mommy, she wants to meet you."

* * *

> I met many parents who came to the school to pledge their cooperation and support at various times. Other parents would stop me on the street and say "You don't know me, but I am ________'s mother." We would then talk for a while.

* * *

> I never got the kind of reception from Negro parents that I get from these parents. They come to PTA. They seek me out in order to speak to me. They have made my experiences most enjoyable.

Two Negro teachers and one white teacher stated that they had met all of the parents of the class during the school year.

A greater percentage of Negro teachers also reported that a large number of parents had visited the school on invitation. Between 41 and 100 per cent of the homeroom classes' parents were reported to have visited the school during the 1963-64 school year by 37.8 per cent of the Negro teachers and 24.4 per cent of the white teachers. The mean percentage of parents who visited the school reported by Negro teachers was 46.1. The mean percentage reported by white teachers was 31.3. Most of the parents came to parent-teacher association meetings and open-house affairs that were held at the schools. It appears that many parents came because their children were taught by Negro teachers and they wanted to meet these teachers. Negro teachers who were serving their second year stated that this was especially true. Two Negro teachers pointed proudly to PTA banners that were displayed in their classrooms. The banners were received for having the highest number of parents in attendance at parent-teacher association meetings.

Few Negro or white teachers visited the homes of parents. No homes were visited by 31.7 per cent of the Negro teachers and 54.1 per cent of the white teachers. Forty per cent or less of the homeroom parents' homes were visited by 31.1 per cent of the Negro teachers, and 25.9 per cent of the white teachers. Over 40 per cent of the parents' homes were visited by 10.6 per cent of the Negro teachers and 3.6 per cent of the white teachers. No teachers reported that over 75 per cent of the homes were visited. Negro teachers explained that they were treated extremely cordially by parents in almost every case. The following statements made by Negro teachers indicated the extent to which Negro teachers have been accepted by parents.

> I took some of my white students home that had missed the bus. At both homes, parents insisted that I get out and come in. They treated me as well as I have been treated in any home.
>
> * * *
>
> I was sent a note by a student asking that I stop by one afternoon. I did so and found that the parents just wanted to thank me personally for the work I was doing with their son.
>
> * * *
>
> I went into a store owned by one of my parents and for the first time in my life he called me Mister_________. He talked so much I just had to back away and leave.

A few Negro teachers reported that they were less well received. One Negro teacher who visited a white parent said that they stood on the porch and talked. "I was never asked to come in," the teacher said.

Negro elementary teachers reported that they had met more of their parents, that more parents had visited the school, and that they had visited more homes than Negro secondary teachers. A tabulation of responses by teaching level showed that 51.6 per cent of the Negro elementary teachers and 32.1 per cent of the Negro secondary teachers had met over 40 per cent of their parents. Over 40 per cent of the parents were reported to have visited the school by 41.1 per cent of the Negro elementary teachers and 30.4 per cent of the secondary teachers. Parents' homes reported visited did not vary very much. Negro elementary teachers reporting over 40 per cent of the homes visited equaled 10.4 per cent and Negro secondary teachers reporting over 40 per cent of the homes visited equaled 7.1 per cent.

These differences can probably be accounted for by parents of elementary children being more concerned about their children since they are in the more formative stages of their lives. Also, in general, the relationship between parents and the elementary school teacher seems to be somewhat closer than the relationship between parents and the secondary teacher. However, the data indicate that parents of both elementary and secondary pupils have accepted faculty desegregation with little resistance.

Preparation Procedures

Administrators were reported in Chapter V to have prepared teachers for the change to desegregated faculties in many instances. In other instances, the contact that Negro teachers and white teachers had experienced in various situations was thought to serve as preparation for faculty desegregation. Preparation, as was implied in Chapter V, is thought to relieve the apprehensions that teachers may have concerning faculty desegregation and also reduce distortions of social perception that may delay adjustment to the change.

Only slightly over one half of the Negro teachers reported that they received some type of preparation for faculty desegregation. No preparation was reported by 42.2 per cent of the Negro teachers and 60.7 per cent of the white teachers. Participation in desegregated in-service programs was considered a form of preparation by 43.3 per cent of the Negro teachers and 31.1 per cent of the white teachers. Talks with the superintendent or principal, the second most frequently used form of preparation, was mentioned by 35.0 per cent of the Negro teachers and 28.9 per cent of the white teachers. Participation in desegregated professional organizations was mentioned by 29.2 per cent of the total group of respondents as a form of preparation. More teachers attended desegregated professional organizations but they did not perceive this attendance as preparation for faculty desegregation because of the limited opportunity for contact. Other forms of preparation for faculty desegregation reported by the respondents were as follows: attended biracial faculty meetings, 3.2 per cent; attended biracial social affairs, 3.2 per cent; exchanged visits to schools, 2.2 per cent; and attended intergroup relations workshop, 2.9 per cent. These responses compare favorably with the reports of superintendents concerning preparation which are listed in Table 6.

Few teachers serving in desegregated faculties feel that there is a need for additional training as preparation for service in a desegregated faculty. Forty-one Negro teachers and 22 white teachers said that additional training in intergroup relations would be beneficial. Six Negro teachers and seven white ones indicated that additional training in academic subjects was needed. Some knowledge of Negro history and accomplishments was perceived as a need by nine Negro and four white teachers. An overwhelming majority of both groups of teachers stated that no additional training was needed. This response came from 124 Negro teachers and 107 white teachers. It appears that most teachers have found that the training possessed by them has adequately prepared them for making the necessary adjustments in desegregated faculties.

Sources of Apprehension

It is generally conceded that adjustment problems to changes such as faculty desegregation can be increased by apprehension concerning the change. Extreme anxiety concerning possible treatment and personal competence can operate to inhibit individuals from performing at the level of which they are capable.

The responses of the teachers in this study reveal that their apprehensions had a variety of sources. The most outstanding finding, however, is that a large number of both Negro and white teachers had no apprehensions. Of those teachers reporting apprehensions, 33 Negro teachers felt that parents would not accept them. Only 20 white teachers expressed this source of apprehension. The second most frequently reported source of apprehension, mentioned by 13 Negro teachers, was a feeling that white teachers would not accept them. Fifteen white teachers felt that Negro teachers might not be able to adjust to teaching in a predominantly white school. Table 20 summarizes the sources of apprehension of teachers concerning faculty desegregation. A study of this table reveals that Negro teachers were more apprehensive about their treatment by parents, students and teachers, while white teachers were more apprehensive about the reaction of parents and the ability of the Negro teachers to adjust to desegregated faculties.

TABLE 20

SOURCES OF APPREHENSION CONCERNING FACULTY DESEGREGATION OF TEACHERS SERVING IN DESEGREGATED FACULTIES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF KENTUCKY

Source of Apprehension	Negro	White	Total
Anticipated unfair administrative treatment of Negro teachers	3	1	4
Felt that Negro teachers would not be able to adjust	3	15	18
Felt that parents would not accept Negro teachers	33	20	53
Felt that teachers would not accept Negro teachers	13	5	18
Felt that students would not accept Negro teachers	9	4	13
Concerned about ability to perform competently in a desegregated school	8	4	12
No apprehensions	111	86	197
Total	180	135	315

The large number of teachers who reported that they had no apprehensions supports the statements of administrators in regard to the favorable prevailing attitude that existed toward faculty desegregation in most communities.

Social Relations of Teachers

Several questions were asked of the respondents in order to determine their perception of the social relationships that existed among teachers of desegregated faculties. The majority of the responses to each question indicated that the social relationships among teachers are very good. Negro teachers' responses regarding classroom visits show that there is no wall of separation between them and white teachers. (The responses of white teachers are not included because a very large number said that their rooms were far away from the Negro teachers' rooms, and therefore, their responses would not be representative.) Nine Negro teachers reported that they never went to other teachers' rooms. Twenty-four teachers said that they visit other teachers' rooms very seldom. Of these teachers, 15 stated that they did not visit because they felt that they would be unwelcome, but because they did not have the time. Visits to other teachers' rooms whenever there was a need to do so was the response of 82.7 per cent of the Negro teachers. White teachers were reported to visit the rooms of Negro teachers whenever there was a need to do so by 87.1 per cent of the Negro teachers. Though Negro teachers apparently do not visit quite as often as white teachers, these responses do indicate that teachers of both races interact freely in desegregated faculties and show little hesitation to enter classrooms of other teachers of the opposite race whenever there is a need to do so.

Often individuals of different groups who are accepted fully in situations that do not call for close contact are less well accepted in social situations that bring them in close contact in an informal atmosphere. To determine if there were limits to which Negro teachers were accepted in social situations related to desegregated faculties, the subjects were asked to respond to two hypothetical situations related to desegregated faculties. The first situation called for a response regarding how they felt a teacher of a different race would react toward sitting beside them in the teachers' lounge. Only 9 of the 180

Negro teachers indicated that they thought that a teacher of the white race would hesitate to sit. Five Negro male teachers felt that white female teachers would remain standing. Two female Negro teachers felt that the white teacher would remain standing. Two additional Negro female teachers did not reply because they never visited the lounge. Two white female teachers felt that Negro male teachers would leave the lounge, and four felt that Negro male teachers would remain standing. Many teachers made comments which indicated that social relations were excellent, such as: "She'd sit and tell me the latest news," "She would immediately sit and ask for a cigarette," and "Why, of course she would sit!"

The second structured situation called for a response in regard to acceptance of a nomination to serve with a teacher of another race as co-chairmen of a committee that would involve after-school meetings in a social setting. Such a nomination reportedly would be accepted by 173 Negro teachers and 131 white teachers. Three male Negro teachers reported that their acceptance would depend on "who the other teacher was." Two Negro males would decline such a nomination with no explanation. Two female Negro teachers reported that their acceptance would depend on "who the other teacher was." Four white female teachers indicated that they would decline for the sake of the Negro teacher. This statement was interpreted by the writer to mean that these teachers thought that the Negro teachers would be highly uncomfortable in such a situation.

The indicated willingness of the large majority of teachers to work together on school-related tasks should come as welcome news to school administrators who may have hesitated to make biracial assignments that may have called for teachers to meet in a social setting.

Extra-School Fraternization

Quite often friendships and associations that are formed at the school result in continued associations outside of the school. It is natural to expect that some teachers of both races will form close ties with teachers of the other race that will extend outside the school. Teachers were questioned concerning the amount of extra-school fraternization that actually existed and the amount that they deemed desirable.

Rides were reported to have been shared by 66.1 per cent of the Negro teachers and 51.9 per cent of the white teachers. This activity was considered desirable by 66.7 per cent of the Negro teachers and 62.2 per cent of the white teachers. Thirty per cent of the Negro teachers and 18.5 per cent of the white ones reported that they attended social functions together. A higher percentage of Negro teachers (46.1 per cent) than white teachers (31.1 per cent) were willing to concede that this activity was desirable and should take place. The respondents have not yet progressed to the point of inviting each other to dinner, nor do they feel that such is desirable. Only two Negro teachers reported that they had been invited to dinner. These same two respondents had found the occasion pleasant and felt that this activity should be entered into on a biracial basis. Although only one respondent, a white teacher, reported that she had attended church with Negro teachers, 15.6 per cent of the white teachers and 5.6 per cent of the Negro teachers reported that this activity was desirable. It is surprising to note that a higher percentage of white teachers than Negro teachers felt that attending church together is a desirable activity.

No contact after school hours was reported by 28.9 per cent of the white teachers and 22.2 per cent of the Negro ones. A much smaller percentage of both white (8.9 per cent) and Negro teachers (18.5per cent) were in favor of no extra-school contact. Many teachers of both races indicated that extra-school fraternization depended on the desires of individual teachers. This statement was made by 11.2 per cent of the white teachers and 17.2 per cent of the Negro teachers. The above data are made more explicit in Table 21.

The responses of teachers in regard to extra-school fraternization indicate that, though this type of association is now limited mostly to the sharing of rides, there will be increased association of Negro and white teachers as they continue to teach and work together in desegregated faculties.

TABLE 21

ACTUAL AND DESIRABLE EXTRA-SCHOOL FRATERNIZATION REPORTED BY 315 TEACHERS SERVING IN DESEGREGATED FACULTIES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF KENTUCKY

Activity	Actual		Desirable	
	Negro	White	Negro	White
Share rides	66.6	51.9	66.7	62.2
Attend social functions together	30.0	18.5	46.1	31.1
Attend church together	--	.7	5.6	15.6
Extend invitations to dinner	1.1	--	8.9	18.5
All contact should be based on the desires of teachers	--	--	17.2	11.9
No contact	22.2	28.9	8.9	18.5

Teacher Satisfaction with Faculty Desegregation

The satisfaction that is gained from interaction in a particular environment results from the kinds of relationships that are established and the treatment that one receives as he goes about his daily tasks. There are, naturally, some aspects of one's experiences that are more satisfying than others. This is no less true of individuals assigned to desegregated faculties than it is of individuals associated with other groups.

Most Satisfying Aspects

Teachers were asked to rank the most pleasing aspects of their experiences in desegregated faculties and give examples of the experiences that pleased them least. Many teachers said that they had not had any displeasing experiences and asked if they might give examples of experiences that had pleased them most. The writer, of course, was delighted to hear this and urged that they record these experiences. Other teachers explained that experiences that were ranked lowest were not necessarily displeasing but were not considered as important as others. One item, "change in student behavior," was eliminated from the list of items to be ranked because a large majority of the respondents reported that they could not honestly assign a rank to this item because there was no change that was pleasing or displeasing. Thus, nine aspects were ranked.

The median rank assigned to each of the nine aspects and the rank order of the aspects classified by the race of the respondents are found in Table 22.

Negro teachers reported that they derived their greatest pleasure from having an opportunity to prove that good teaching depends on the competency of the teacher rather than on race. These teachers indicated that they considered themselves pioneers and are cognizant of the fact that the record made by them will influence the placement of additional Negro teachers. This aspect, however, reflects personal satisfaction and is only indirectly related to faculty desegregation. "Equal treatment of teachers by administrators" received a high ranking by both Negro and white teachers. This aspect was ranked highest by white teachers and second highest by Negro teachers. It also was ranked highest by the total group of teachers. All 17 comments concerning treatment by administrators, except three, were favorable. The following comments have been selected to show the kind of administrative behavior that has led to teacher satisfaction. They are thought to be representative of all comments made.

> Had the principal not been as firm in his commitment as he was, I would not have been accepted as completely as I was.

* * *

> The superintendent and principal were really responsible for the fine reception and lack of adjustment problems.

* * *

> The support given Negro teachers by the principal and superintendent was primarily responsible for the way the Negro teachers were accepted.
>
> * * *
>
> The principal told me to call on him for anything that I needed. From time to time he would stop by and ask me if everything was going all right.

TABLE 22

RANK ASSIGNED NINE SATISFYING ASPECTS OF DESEGREGATED FACULTIES BY 315 TEACHERS SERVING IN DESEGREGATED FACULTIES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF KENTUCKY

Aspect	Negro		White		Total	
	Median Rank	Rank Order	Median Rank	Rank Order	Median Rank	Rank Order
Equal treatment of teachers by administrators	2.1	2	1.9	1	2.1	1
Chance to prove that it is competency, not race, that counts	1.8	1	2.8	3	2.2	2
Acceptance of faculty desegregation by students	3.1	3	3.1	4	3.1	3
Chance to exchange ideas with teachers of another race	4.0	4	2.6	2	3.5	4
Acceptance and "fitting in" behaviors of other teachers	5.2	6	5.4	6	5.3	6
Placement of Negro teachers	5.4	7	5.6	7	5.5	7
Favorable change in prestige and status	6.1	8	7.2	8	6.6	8
Social activities involving Negro and white teachers	7.7	9	7.6	9	7.7	9

Rank order correlation = .91

Negative comments were as follows:

> The principal favors the Negro teachers. He makes a special effort to see to it that they are satisfied.
>
> * * *
>
> The principal is very prejudiced. Once in a meeting he called all the other teachers " Mr. and Mrs." He called me by my first name.
>
> * * *
>
> The administrators don't really want us on the faculty. They tolerate us because they know they have to.

The majority of the above statements indicate that the attitude taken by administrators toward faculty desegregation has been a major factor in the acceptance of Negro teachers and the lack of problems.

Acceptance of faculty desegregation by students was ranked as the third most satisfying aspect by Negro teachers, fourth most satisfying by white teachers, and third most satisfying by the total group. Many teachers said that this aspect was ranked high because they had felt that there would be problems with students and had found that there were none. Typical favorable comments were as follows:

> I have been completely accepted by the students. They request to be transferred to my classes.
>
> * * *
>
> Some students came to the gym to get me one day. They told me a man wanted to see me. I found instead that they had found out that it was my birthday and had prepared a birthday party for me.
>
> * * *
>
> All of the students want to hug and kiss me every afternoon.
>
> * * *
>
> All of the students are exceptionally nice. They show more respect for me that they do for some of the white teachers.
>
> * * *

> I was overjoyed by the way our students accepted the Negro teachers as members of the faculty.

Negative comments were received from only two teachers. Both were Negroes.

> I was called a foul name because I asked a student to comply with a school regulation.

* * *

> Some students for some reason are always rough-housing in front of my door. A few others are discourteous at times.

The chance to exchange ideas with teachers of another race was ranked second by white teachers and fourth by Negro teachers. It was ranked fourth by the total group. The seven comments made concerning this aspect were of a general nature. None were negative. Typical comments were as follows:

> I have a deeper understanding of people in general since talking with our colored teacher.

* * *

> I have enjoyed exchanging views with Mrs.____________.

* * *

> Mrs._________ has given me many helpful suggestions that have made me a better teacher.

* * *

> I have enjoyed having the opportunity to exchange ideas with our Negro teachers.

Acceptance of faculty desegregation by parents was ranked fifth by both groups of teachers. It is rather surprising that this aspect was more pleasing to teachers than acceptance by teachers. The writer asked several teachers why they ranked acceptance by parents ahead of acceptance by teachers. Several teachers said they felt that parents actually had accepted them more readily than had teachers. Others said that more resistance was expected from parents and when it did not materialize they were quite pleased. No teacher made a single negative statement concerning parents. Twenty-two Negro teachers and four white teachers made comments. Representative comments made are the following:

> Parents asked to have their children placed in my room.
>
> * * *
>
> I have been accepted better by parents and students than by teachers.
>
> * * *
>
> I was accepted much more readily by parents than I had expected.
>
> * * *
>
> I got a better response from white parents than I did from Negro parents.
>
> * * *
>
> Parents' reaction to the colored teachers was extremely gratifying.
>
> * * *
>
> I was proud of the reception given the Negro teachers by parents of this community.

The acceptance and "fitting in" behaviors of teachers was the sixth-ranked aspect. Though teachers have indicated that relations are good on desegregated faculties, their comments indicate that these relations can be improved. Seven teachers, three of whom were white, made favorable comments. Twenty made comments that are indicative of displeasure. Two of these comments came from white teachers. Representative favorable comments are the following:

> Our Negro teachers are all excellent.
>
> * * *
>
> We have been treated most cordially by teachers. I have made several very close friends.
>
> * * *
>
> The teachers on this faculty are all just one big happy family. We enjoy and respect each other.

Typical negative comments were these:

> I was displeased by coming daily face to face with teachers, particularly the older ones, who purposely refused to exchange a greeting.

* * *

> The librarian berated me on several occasions in a manner that was very unethical.

* * *

> Some teachers wouldn't speak at first and made slurring remarks. Few teachers have made friendly overtures.

* * *

> The Negro teacher has an antagonistic attitude. It's hard to talk to her.

* * *

> The "machinery" of the school does not run as smoothly as it did before because some people do not carry out their responsibilities. It's difficult to do work because of the lack of care of materials which are shared.

* * *

> I'm tired of having teachers single out everything I do or wear for praise. They pretend that many simple things that I do are "so wonderful."

These unfavorable comments show no pattern but they do indicate that teachers need to be more cognizant of the use of common courtesies in their day-to-day relations.

Less Satisfying Aspects

The three lowest-ranked aspects were not, according to a majority of the teachers, dissatisfying but they were not considered as important and, therefore, were given a lower ranking.

The seventh-ranked aspect was "placement of Negro teachers." No white teachers recorded comments concerning placement of Negro teachers. Many said that they were not displeased with the placement of Negro teachers but had not gained any especial satisfaction from the procedures used in placing

Negro teachers. Only six Negro teachers made comments, three of which were favorable and three unfavorable.

> I was given the grade that I requested. I've enjoyed teaching at this level.

* * *

> I was placed near two teachers that have helped me by sharing materials and information.

* * *

> I was assigned to a classroom rather than the library. I was grateful for that.

* * *

> I like the library very well, but I'd rather be in a classroom teaching.

* * *

> I don't appreciate being placed in the library. It is a reminder that I'm not considered capable of teaching a class.

* * *

> At first I resented being placed in a portable classroom. I think now that I like it as well as I would a regular classroom.

It appears that few teachers are actually concerned about the placement of Negro teachers. Their placement in desegregated faculties has been accepted as a matter of course with little displeasure or pleasure resulting therefrom by most teachers.

A large majority of the teachers indicated that "change in prestige and status" was ranked low because there had been no change in prestige and status as a result of being assigned to desegregated faculties. No respondents recorded comments, but two white teachers told the writer that some of their southern friends have a low opinion of their decision to continue working in a desegregated faculty. Nine Negro teachers who gave this aspect a rank of (1) felt that there had been a favorable change in prestige and status. They told the writer that they were treated with "a little more dignity and respect by the community" since they were assigned to desegregated faculties.

Social activities involving white and Negro teachers was ranked lowest in satisfaction by the respondents. Again, a large majority of the teachers reported that they participated in few biracial social activities and were not concerned about doing so. Thus, there was little dissatisfaction but the aspect was ranked low because few opportunities for participation in biracial social activities had occurred. Three comments were recorded. They were all negative and indicated some dissatisfaction.

> There will never be social activities between white and Negro teachers in this school.

* * *

> The subject of social activities involving white and Negro teachers is completely avoided.

* * *

> Social activities involving Caucasian and Negro teachers are not likely to take place in the near future.

The aspects were not ranked by 18 white and 14 Negro teachers because they had found all aspects very pleasing; so they stated.

The ranks assigned to the various aspects of desegregated faculties show that both Negro and white teachers are highly pleased with the behavior of administrators, the attitude of students, and the opportunity to interact with teachers of another race. Changes in prestige and status and social activities of a biracial nature have been sources of low satisfaction. The coefficient of correlation for the ranks assigned the nine aspects by Negro and white teachers was .91. This high coefficient is further substantiating evidence that teachers of both races are in close agreement in regard to the satisfaction derived from desegregated conditions.

Table 23 shows that there is little difference in the median ranks assigned the nine aspects by white teachers of different size districts and white and Negro teachers of large districts. The coefficients of correlation were .97 and .99 respectively. The median of the ranks assigned the aspects relating to teacher relations are higher for Negro teachers of large districts, while

TABLE 23

RANKS ASSIGNED NINE SATISFYING ASPECTS OF DESEGREGATED FACULTIES BY 315 TEACHERS OF DESEGREGATED FACULTIES IN KENTUCKY, CLASSIFIED SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT

Aspects	Small Districts				Large Districts			
	Negro		White		Negro		White	
	Med. Rank	Rank Ord.	Med. Rank	Rank Ord.	Med. Rank	Rank Ord.	Med. Rank	Rank Ord.
Equal treatment of teachers by administrators	1.9	2	1.7	1	2.5	2	2.0	1
Chance to prove that it is competency, not race, that counts	1.5	1	2.5	2	1.1	1	2.3	2
Acceptance of faculty desegregation by students	3.2	3	3.0	3	3.8	4	4.2	4
Chance to exchange ideas with teachers of another race	4.8	5	4.0	4	2.8	3	2.7	3
Acceptance of Negro teachers by parents	4.0	4	5.0	6	4.6	5	4.7	5
Acceptance and "fitting in" behavior of other teachers	5.3	7	4.3	5	5.5	6	5.5	6
Placement of Negro teachers	5.2	6	5.1	7	6.2	7	6.3	7
Favorable change in prestige and status	6.3	8	6.8	8	7.2	8	7.1	8
Social activities involving Negro and white teachers	7.8	9	7.4	9	8.0	9	8.0	9

Rank order correlations: Negro teachers = .93; white teachers = .97; small district teachers = .90; large district teachers = 99.

acceptance by parents and placement of Negro teachers were ranked higher by Negro teachers of small districts. White teachers assigned higher ranks to the aspects relating to teacher relations than did Negro teachers. The lowest coefficient of correlation (.90) of the four groups compared was obtained for Negro and white teachers of small districts. Negro teachers of small districts had a higher median rank for "acceptance by parents" than any of the other three groups included in Table 23. These teachers apparently were quite pleased by the reception given them by parents.

Satisfaction with General Conditions

In order to determine the over-all attitude of teachers toward their experiences in desegregated faculties, they were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement with ten statements related to general conditions in desegregated faculties. Five different responses were used in determining the extent of agreement or disagreement.

An examination of Table 24 shows that 88.9 per cent of the Negro teachers and 86.9 per cent of the white teachers consider their experience in a desegregated faculty a valuable one. Negro teachers are slightly more enthusiastic in their response in that 51.6 per cent answered "yes, very much," while 41.5 per cent of the white teachers responded in this manner. Only 12.3 per cent of the respondents were undecided or gave negative responses.

Additional evidence that Negro teachers have not been treated unfairly by administrators is provided by the 89.9 per cent of the respondents who indicated that Negro teachers are treated fairly in every respect by administrators. Favorable responses came from 91.1 per cent of the white teachers and 88.9 per cent of the Negro teachers. This slight difference is in keeping with the ranks assigned to "equal treatment of teachers by administrators" which was discussed in the preceding section. More important, though, is the fact that no teacher gave a negative response. However, it is possible that some of the 8.6 per cent of the respondents who were undecided felt that Negro teachers

TABLE 24

RESPONSES OF 315 TEACHERS SERVING IN DESEGREGATED FACULTIES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF KENTUCKY TO TEN STATEMENTS CONCERNING SATISFACTION WITH THE DESEGREGATION OF FACULTIES

Statements		Yes Very Much	Yes	Undecided	No	No Definitely
I consider my experience in a desegregated faculty a valuable one that I would not have wanted to miss	N	52.8	36.1	8.9	1.7	.5
	W	41.5	44.4	10.4	3.0	.7
	T	47.9	39.7	9.5	2.2	.6
I feel that the Negro teachers are treated fairly in every respect by administrators	N	45.6	43.3	8.3	2.8	0
	W	52.6	38.5	8.9	0	0
	T	48.6	41.3	8.6	1.6	0
I feel that Negro teachers on the faculty have led to a reduction of prejudice and greater respect for Negroes	N	52.2	36.7	7.8	3.3	0
	W	32.5	52.6	8.9	0	0
	T	46.3	43.5	8.3	1.9	0
I enjoy my work as much in a desegregated faculty as I did in a segregated one	N	52.8	42.2	3.3	1.7	0
	W	37.8	56.3	5.9	0	0
	T	46.3	48.3	4.4	.9	0
I feel that additional Negro teachers would not adversely affect our school	N	41.1	45.6	13.3	0	0
	W	37.1	49.6	13.3	0	0
	T	39.4	47.3	13.3	0	0
I had great apprehensions about faculty desegregation but they have disappeared	N	27.1	65.7	7.2	0	0
	W	40.8	55.1	4.1	0	0
	T	32.8	61.3	5.9	0	0
I regret having decided to work in a desegregated faculty	N	0	1.1	11.1	51.1	36.7
	W	0	0	12.6	45.9	41.5
	T	0	.6	11.7	48.9	38.8
I feel that my fellow teachers consider work in a desegregated faculty a pleasant and valuable experience	N	33.3	45.0	17.9	3.8	0
	W	18.5	54.1	23.0	4.4	0
	T	27.0	48.9	20.3	3.8	0
Our Negro teachers worked harder than other teachers to prove that Negro teachers are not inferior	N	5.0	12.2	14.4	58.3	10.1
	W	4.4	12.6	11.1	57.1	14.8
	T	4.8	12.4	13.0	58.0	11.8
If conditions were favorable, I'd like to return to a segregated faculty	N	2.2	2.8	5.0	56.7	33.3
	W	.7	2.2	10.4	61.5	25.2
	T	1.6	2.5	7.3	58.7	29.8

N = Negro; W = white; T = total.

were treated unfairly but were reluctant to so indicate.

Many teachers of both races indicated that Negro teachers on the faculty had led to a reduction of prejudice. That Negro teachers were more enthusiastic in their response is indicated by 52.2 per cent using the category "yes very much," while 38.5 per cent of the white teachers used this category. This reported change in attitude might be taken as additional evidence that many recalcitrant individuals who were reluctant initially now accept faculty desegregation.

The 94.1 per cent of the total group of respondents who reported that they enjoyed working in a desegregated faculty as much as in a segregated one reflect the accuracy of administrators' evaluations of the success of the transition. Negro teachers were slightly more favorable in their responses in that 52.8 per cent replied "yes very much." This reply was given by 37.8 per cent of the white teachers. Only three Negro teachers stated that they did not enjoy their work as much in a desegregated faculty as they did in a segregated one.

Teachers not only enjoy their work, but they feel that other teachers do also; so reported 75.9 per cent of the total group of respondents. There is an indication that teachers feel that other teachers are not quite as satisfied with their assignment to desegregated faculties as are the subjects who were interviewed. This indication is gathered from the 20.3 per cent of the respondents whose response was "undecided" and the 3.8 per cent whose response was "no."

Teachers' experiences in desegregated faculties have influenced them to feel that additional Negro teachers would not adversely affect the schools to which they are assigned. The "yes very much" response of 41.1 per cent of the Negro teachers and the 37.1 per cent of the white teachers implies that they are very much in favor of additional Negro teachers being placed on desegregated faculties. It is significant that no teachers indicated that they felt that additional Negro teachers would have an adverse effect on schools. It must be kept in mind, however, that some of the teachers included in the 13.3 per cent who were "undecided" could have felt negatively about the placement of additional Negro teachers but refrained from admitting such feeling.

Of the teachers who reported apprehensions, 94.1 per cent indicated that these apprehensions had disappeared. White teachers indicated a more complete disappearance in that 40.8 per cent used the category "yes very much" while 27.1 per cent of the Negro teachers used this category.

More ambivalence was expressed relative to the statement "Our Negro teachers worked harder than other teachers to prove that Negro teachers are not inferior" than to any other statement. Table 24 shows that about one sixth of both Negro and white teachers felt that Negro teachers had worked harder. Thirteen per cent of both groups of respondents were undecided. Denial that Negro teachers had worked harder came from 68.4 per cent of the Negro teachers and 71.9 per cent of the white teachers. Apparently a few Negro teachers have felt that it was necessary for them to put forth increased effort, while the majority of the Negro teachers have not felt that this was necessary.

The rejection of the statement "I regret having decided to work in a desegregated faculty" by 87.4 per cent of the white teachers and 86.8 per cent of the Negro teachers supports the responses concerning enjoyment of work. Some inconsistency is found, however, in that only 5.3 per cent of the respondents were undecided or did not enjoy their work. Yet, 12.3 per cent were undecided or regretted the decision to work in a desegregated faculty. Apparently some individuals enjoy their work but are not certain that they made the right decision in agreeing to work in a desegregated faculty.

A large majority of the teachers have no desire to return to segregated faculties even under favorable circumstances. Ninety per cent of the Negro teachers and 86.7 per cent of the white teachers reported that they have no desire to return to segregated faculties. Five per cent of the Negro respondents indicated that they would like to return to segregated faculties. A third of the Negro and a fourth of the white respondents definitely did not desire to return to segregated faculties. The writer can not forget the comment of one elderly male Negro teacher. He said, "No, I don't want to return. This is the most pleasant experience I've had in thirty years of teaching."

The above analysis of the respondents' replies indicates that an overwhelming majority of the teachers are very satisfied with their assignment in desegregated faculties. They enjoy their work, they feel that other teachers enjoy their work and they have no desire to return to a segregated faculty. An inspection of Table 24 shows that white teachers were slightly more favorable in their responses to the second, third, sixth, seventh, and ninth statements. Negro teachers were slightly more favorable in their responses to the remaining five statements. The interpretation of the data indicates that Negro and white teachers are about equally satisfied with their assignments in desegregated faculties. Slightly more Negro teachers are dissatisfied to the point of wanting to return to a segregated faculty under desirable conditions.

Correlates of Satisfaction

The responses of teachers to six selected statements concerning satisfaction were classified by teaching level, amount of training, the type of school attended as is shown in Table 25. The responses to the same six statements were also classified by age, district size, and percentage of Negro students in the school. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 26. "Yes definitely" and "yes" responses were grouped as one category, and "undecided," "no," and "no definitely" responses were grouped into another category.

Table 25 reveals little variation in the percentage of favorable replies given by elementary and secondary teachers. Elementary teachers were slightly more favorable in their responses to three statements, as were secondary teachers. The largest variation is in the responses to the statement concerning how other teachers are thought to feel about faculty desegregation.

TABLE 25

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS SERVING IN DESEGREGATED FACULTIES IN KENTUCKY TO SIX STATEMENTS CONCERNING SATISFACTION WITH FACULTY DESEGREGATION CLASSIFIED BY TEACHING LEVEL, AMOUNT OF TRAINING, AND TYPE OF SCHOOL ATTENDED

Statement		Teaching Level		Amount of Training		Type School Attended	
		Elem.	Sec.	Bac.	Mas.	Deseg.	Seg.
Experience in desegregated faculty is considered valuable	(1)	86.9	89.0	85.2	91.5	88.3	86.3
	(2)	13.1	11.0	4.8	8.5	11.7	13.7
Feels Negro teachers have led to a reduction of prejudice	(1)	89.8	90.0	88.8	92.5	91.1	87.3
	(2)	10.2	10.0	11.2	7.5	8.9	12.7
Enjoys work as much as in a segregated faculty	(1)	94.7	94.5	93.4	96.6	93.8	94.1
	(2)	5.3	5.5	6.6	3.4	6.2	5.9
Feels that additional Negro teachers would not adversely affect the school	(1)	85.9	88.1	87.8	84.7	88.3	83.3
	(2)	14.1	11.9	12.2	15.3	11.7	16.7
Feels other teachers consider experience in a desegregated faculty pleasant and valuable	(1)	75.7	67.0	71.6	74.6	73.7	74.5
	(2)	24.3	33.0	28.4	25.4	26.3	25.5
Would not like to return to a segregated faculty	(1)	89.8	88.1	87.3	90.6	87.7	90.1
	(2)	10.2	11.9	12.7	9.4	12.3	9.9

Elem. = Elementary; Sec. = Secondary; Bac. = Bachelor's; Mas. = Master's; Deseg. = Desegregated; Seg. = Segregated.
(1) = Total of percentage of "yes definitely" and "yes" responses.
(2) = Total of percentage of "undecided, " "no, " and "no definitely" responses.

Favorable responses came from 75.7 per cent of the elementary teachers and 67.0 per cent of the secondary teachers. This difference could be due to secondary schools being generally larger, thus making it more difficult to get an indication of how a cross section of the faculty feels about the change. The responses to the selected statements indicated that elementary teachers are as satisfied with faculty desegregation as are secondary teachers.

A higher proportion of the teachers with master's degrees responded favorably to five of the six selected statements. Teachers with bachelor's degrees or less were more favorable in their opinion that additional Negro teachers would not adversely affect the school. The largest variation is in the responses to the statement indicating that experiences in a desegregated faculty are considered valuable. The difference of 5.2 per cent is accounted for by 85.2 per cent of the teachers with bachelor's degrees and 91.5 per cent of the teachers with master's degrees responding favorably. The responses infer that teachers with master's degrees are slightly more satisfied with their assignments in desegregated faculties.

Little variation was found in the responses of teachers who had attended desegregated schools and those who had attended segregated schools. Respondents of desegregated schools were slightly more favorable in their responses to three statements, while respondents from segregated schools were more favorable to three statements. The largest variation is in responses to the statement concerning the effectiveness of Negro teachers in reducing prejudice. Affirmative replies came from 91.1 per cent of the teachers who attended desegregated schools and from 87.3 per cent of the teachers who attended segregated schools. The percentage of favorable responses to all other statements is very close. It appears that the type of school attended has little bearing on the way teachers interpret their experiences in a desegregated faculty.

Table 26 reveals that teachers 50 years old or older were less favorable in their responses than teachers under 50 years old. A higher percentage

TABLE 26

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS SERVING IN DESEGREGATED FACULTIES IN KENTUCKY TO SIX STATEMENTS CONCERNING SATISFACTION WITH FACULTY DESEGREGATION CLASSIFIED BY AGE, DISTRICT SIZE, AND PERCENTAGE OF NEGROES IN SCHOOL

Statement		Age		District Size		Percentage of Negro Students	
		Under 50	50 or Over	Small	Large	10% or Less	Over 10%
Experience in desegregated faculty is considered valuable	(1)	89.2	85.6	86.7	88.3	87.1	87.7
	(2)	10.8	14.4	13.3	11.7	12.9	12.3
Feels Negro teachers have led to a reduction of prejudice	(1)	92.0	87.1	91.1	85.9	90.1	89.3
	(2)	8.0	12.9	14.1	8.9	9.9	10.7
Enjoys work as much as in a segregated faculty	(1)	96.0	94.2	93.3	95.0	92.1	96.9
	(2)	4.0	5.8	6.3	5.0	7.9	3.1
Feels that additional Negro teachers would not adversely affect the school	(1)	87.5	85.6	85.9	85.6	88.7	84.4
	(2)	12.5	14.4	14.1	4.4	11.3	15.6
Feels that other teachers consider experience in a desegregated faculty pleasant and valuable	(1)	71.0	74.8	73.3	72.2	73.7	71.0
	(2)	29.0	25.2	26.7	27.8	26.3	28.7
Would not like to return to a segregated faculty	(1)	94.3	81.3	88.1	88.9	88.1	88.7
	(2)	5.7	18.7	11.9	11.1	11.9	11.3

(1) = Total of percentage of "yes definitely" and "yes" responses.
(2) = Total of percentage of "undecided," "no," and "no definitely" responses.

of teachers 50 years old or older responded favorably to only one of the six statements. Percentagewise, more of these teachers thought that other teachers considered working in a desegregated faculty a pleasant experience. A marked variation is noted in the responses of the two groups regarding the desire not to return to a segregated faculty. Of the teachers under 50 years old, 94.3 per cent indicated no desire to return to a segregated faculty, while 81.3 per cent of the teachers over 50 years old indicated no desire to return. The data seems to indicate that teachers 50 years old and older are slightly less satisfied with their assignments to desegregated faculties than are teachers under 50 years old.

The analysis of the responses of teachers from large and small districts showed no relationship between the size of the district and favorable responses to the statements. However, a marked variation was found in the responses to one statement. Apparently more teachers from small districts (91.1 per cent) feel that Negro teachers have led to a reduction of prejudice than do teachers from large districts (84.9 per cent). Small variations were found in the responses to the other statements. It appears that teachers of small districts are as satisfied with their assignments to desegregated faculties as are teachers of large districts.

There is little relationship between the responses to the six selected statements and the percentage of Negroes in the school. Those teachers of schools with 10 per cent or less Negro students gave a higher percentage of favorable responses to two statements. They were more favorable in their opinion that additional Negro teachers would not adversely affect the school. Favorable responses came from 88.7 per cent of the teachers of schools with 10 per cent or less Negro enrollment, while 84.4 per cent of the teachers from schools with over 10 per cent Negro enrollment gave favorable responses to this statement. Teachers from schools with 10 per cent or less Negro enrollment were also slightly more favorable in their belief that other teachers considered their experience in a desegregated faculty a pleasant and valuable one. Teachers from schools with over 10 per cent Negro enrollment gave more favorable responses to the statement concerning enjoyment of work as much as in a segregated faculty. The relative percentages were 96.9 per cent and 92.1 per cent. Practically no variation exists in the responses to the remaining three statements.

The responses of teachers to the selected items indicate that older teachers and teachers with bachelor's degrees or less are slightly less satisfied with their assignment to desegregated faculties. There is no appreciable difference in the satisfaction of teachers when they are classified by teaching level, type of school attended, size of districts, and percentage of Negro students in the school.

The variation in responses was checked for significant differences at the .05 level by using the chi square test. The difference in the responses of teachers 50 years old and older and teachers under 50 years old in regard to the desire to return to segregated faculties was significant. No other differences were significant at the .05 level.

Chapter Summary

The teachers serving in desegregated faculties in the school districts studied are highly qualified in regard to professional training and experience. Negro teachers are slightly older and have slightly more professional training and teaching experience than white teachers. The extensive training and long years of experience that are possessed by many Negro teachers was felt to be a factor in the ready acceptance of faculty desegregation. A large majority of both Negro and white teachers have attended desegregated schools. Most of the respondents attended graduate schools that enrolled both white and Negro students. The respondents indicated that this interaction was of much value in adjusting to faculty desegregation.

Negro teachers have been assigned primarily as classroom teachers and librarians. A few teachers are utilized in administrative positions and as coaches. Changes in assignments that resulted from faculty desegregation were most prevalent among former Negro principals and elementary teachers. The majority of the former Negro principals are now assigned as secondary teachers. Many Negro elementary teachers have become special teachers and librarians.

Negro teachers are assigned to all grades and teach many varied subjects in the secondary schools. They have also been assigned extra-curricular duties that were reported to have facilitated acceptance in a few instances. Negro teachers have not been denied the opportunity to share in the leadership of professional organizations and parent-teacher associations. Only slightly more white than Negro teachers indicated that they had served in leadership capacities in professional organizations.

Teachers' perceptions of teacher-student relations were primarily favorable. Responses of teachers indicated that white students initiated contact with white teachers slightly more than they did with Negro teachers. Negro students were perceived to be more hesitant than white students in their interaction with teachers. A larger percentage of Negro teachers than white ones reported that contact was frequently initiated by Negro students. Over one half of the Negro teachers and about one third of the white teachers perceived that Negro students felt more secure and better accepted with Negro teachers on the faculty. Most teachers of both races felt that faculty desegregation had resulted in no change in discipline problems. Several Negro teachers had more problems with Negro students than with white ones.

Surprisingly, Negro teachers reported that a larger percentage of the parents of homeroom classes had been met than did white teachers. Negro teachers also reported that more parents had visited the school. Few teachers of either race visited parents' homes, but those who did reported that they were treated with much respect.

Only about one half of the teachers reported some form of preparation for the change to desegregated faculties. The most frequent forms of preparation were attendance at desegregated in-service meetings and professional meetings. Lack of specific preparation did not result in many teachers having apprehensions. Less than one half of both Negro and white teachers had apprehensions. The greatest source of apprehension was the feeling that parents would not accept Negro teachers. Negro teachers were also concerned about acceptance by white teachers, while white teachers were concerned about the ability of Negro teachers to adjust to desegregated conditions.

Social relations among teachers of desegregated faculties were reported to be very good. However, there is little extra-school contact between teachers of different races, other than the sharing of rides. Several teachers of both races indicated that as teachers work together longer and become accustomed to one another more extra-school contact can be expected, especially in the attendance of church and social functions.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this investigation was to study factors related to faculty desegregation. This purpose was accomplished by analyzing (1) the historical development of faculty desegregation in the Southern region and in Kentucky, (2) the kind and extent of preparation for faculty desegregation, (3) the professional qualifications and assignments of teachers serving in desegregated faculties, (4) the perceptions of teachers regarding the prevailing conditions in desegregated faculties, and (5) teacher satisfaction with faculty desegregation.

Faculty desegregation was conceived of as a social transition that requires the restructuring of relationships within the broad social milieu. Success in this transition was held to be closely related to the plans and procedures utilized in desegregating faculties, the competency of teachers involved, and the kind of intergroup relations that exist.

The data for this study was secured by interviewing 88 administrators and 315 teachers. Interviews were conducted with 180 Negro teachers and 135 white teachers. These respondents were located in 38 school districts in Kentucky with desegregated faculties. Additional data were gathered from the Kentucky Department of Education.

Elementary statistical procedures were used to analyze the data. The data are of such nature that they are best treated by descriptive methods.

Faculty desegregation began in the public schools of Kentucky in 1956 with the assignment of 10 Negro teachers to all-white faculties. Continued increases in faculty desegregation resulted in the assignment of 246 Negro teachers and 2,292 white teachers to desegregated faculties in 43 school districts by 1963-1964. Over one half of the teachers are located in the Louisville school district. The greatest increase in the number of teachers serving in desegregated faculties occurred during 1963-1964, the year following an opinion by the state attorney general that the section of the tenure law regarding reduction of the number of teachers applied equally to Negro and white teachers.

The primary reason given for the decision to desegregate faculties was the desire to close Negro schools. These schools were expensive to operate due to decreases in enrollment. In other cases, the school buildings were dilapidated, or consolidation plans called for the closing of all small schools. The above reason was given by administrators from 47.4 per cent of the school districts. In 21.1 per cent of the districts, the decision was made in order to provide for the assignment of teachers on a non-discriminatory basis. The decision was made in 28.9 per cent of the districts as a result of court orders and the threat of court orders.

Informal means of determining readiness were used by most administrators. Evaluation of student desegregation was the method utilized by 34.1 per cent of the administrators. Talks with community leaders, the second most frequently used method of determining readiness, was reported by 23.9 per cent of the respondents. A few administrators utilized the recommendations of citizens committees and their own intuition.

Specific preparation of communities for the transition to desegregated faculties was reported by 38.7 per cent of the administrators. No preparation procedures were utilized by 57.9 per cent either because of the perceived adequacy of preparation for student desegregation, or because of the belief that the community was sufficiently ready for the change. Community human relations organizations were reported to have prepared the community by 10.2 per cent of the administrators. Talks to civic organizations, the most widely used preparation procedure, were utilized by 20.5 per cent of the respondents. Discussions in parent-teacher association meetings were held by 8.0 per cent of the administrators.

No specific preparation of students was provided by 63.3 per cent of the respondents due to the belief that students would accept the transition readily. Some class talks were given by teachers and principals.

Some form of preparation of teachers for the transition to desegregated faculties was reported by 77.3 per cent of the administrators. The most frequently used procedures were the establishment of biracial in-service meetings, talks with faculties by principals, and the formation of biracial professional committees. The percentage of administrators reporting the utilization of these procedures were 38.5, 27.3, and 19.3 respectively.

A variety of plans were adopted by 75.0 per cent of the administrators for handling objections to Negro teachers. The most prevalent plan, adopted by 23.7 per cent of the administrators, was to permit no transfers from Negro teachers' classes. The second most frequently used plan was to ask parents to let children remain in the Negro teachers' classes for a specified time; reportedly used by 12.5 per cent of the respondents. Objections were avoided by 11.4 per cent of the administrators by assigning Negro teachers to elective or rotating classes.

The Negro teachers initially assigned to desegregated faculties were selected in 75.0 per cent of the small school districts and 40.0 per cent of the large ones on the basis of their tenure status and present employment in the school district. In most of the districts where Negro teachers were selected on other criteria, the teachers chosen were ones that had continuing contracts. This indicates that legal requirements were given more consideration than professional competency and personal characteristics in the selection of Negro teachers.

That the outlook for the employment of additional Negro teachers is improving is indicated by 34.1 per cent of the administrators who stated that additional Negro teachers will be hired on merit and qualifications. According to the statements of 26.1 per cent of the administrators, Negro teachers will be hired if they are highly qualified, or for positions that are hard to fill. Thus, 60.2 per cent of the administrators are willing to hire additional Negro teachers. Additional Negro teachers have been hired in 7 of the 10 districts in which they filed applications. The lack of clear policy statements concerning assignment policies may be a factor in so few applications being filed. Only 12.5 per cent of the administrators stated that policy statements were formulated at the time faculty desegregation was initiated.

Administrators' evaluation of the transition to desegregated faculties as successful is confirmed by the low number of requests for transfers from Negro teachers' classes. Requests were received by 41.6 per cent of the elementary principals and 31.5 per cent of the secondary principals. Yet, a mean number of 2.5 requests were received by elementary principals and 6.0 by secondary principals. These data indicate that there is no greater resistance to faculty desegregation at the elementary level than there is at the secondary level.

Of the 17 techniques listed as useful in the desegregation of faculties, the two most frequently mentioned indicated opposing views. A fourth of the subjects suggested that the change should be made as quietly as possible, while 23.9 per cent indicated that the community should be informed of objectives and plans. The two views are reconciled when it is pointed out that the community can be informed of plans and the implementation still be carried out quietly and routinely. Other high ranking techniques were (3) "select superior teachers to initiate the change," (4) "use talks to insure community acceptance," and (5) "begin with local experienced teachers."

The community conditions reported to have facilitated the transition were related to the size and character of the school districts. Small district administrators listed more frequently as facilitating conditions (1) the small percentage of Negroes in the community, (2) a realization of the inevitability of faculty desegregation, and (3) the high respect for Negroes and Negro teachers that existed in the community. Large district administrators mentioned more frequently (1) the firm favorable attitude of community leaders, (2) a high economic and educational level, and (3) general satisfaction with student desegregation as facilitating conditions. Other frequently mentioned facilitating conditions were pride in integrated athletic teams and open channels of communication between races.

That the preparation for and implementation of faculty desegregation has resulted in a successful transition is substantiated by only 25.0 per cent of the administrators listing factors that worked against the transition. Opposition by individuals from low socio-economic levels was more prevalent in small districts than in large ones. Twenty-two per cent of the small district administrators reported this source of opposition, while 10.3 per cent of the large district administrators reported similar opposition. Only one case of resistance by school board members was reported. Where administrators have presented plans for desegregation of faculties for official board action the pattern has been to accept these plans with little hesitation or need to convince board members of the desirability of the transition.

Teachers that are serving in desegregated faculties are quite mature and well qualified in terms of professional training and experience. The mean age of Negro teachers was 46.3 years and of white teachers was 44.6 years. Only bachelor's degrees or less were held by 59.4 per cent of the Negro teachers and 66.7 per cent of the white teachers. Master's degrees or above are possessed by 40.6 per cent of the Negro and 33.3 per cent of the white teachers. The high level of training possessed by Negro teachers is thought to have been a factor in the lack of resistance to faculty desegregation.

Two thirds, or 66.7 per cent, of the white teachers and 80.6 per cent of the Negro teachers have attended desegregated schools. The majority of both races of teachers took graduate courses in which members of the opposite race were enrolled. This prior contact of teachers with members of the opposite race was reported to have reduced apprehensions and facilitated adjustment to desegregated faculties. Negro teachers had slightly more teaching experience than white teachers. Over 20 years of experience were possessed by 33.9 per cent of the Negro teachers and 20.7 per cent of the white teachers. Less than 8 years of experience were possessed by 14.8 per cent of the Negro and 31.9 per cent of the white teachers.

Possession of continuing contracts by 86.7 per cent of the Negro teachers and 72.6 per cent of the white teachers is further evidence that tenure status was a factor in the assignment of Negro teachers to desegregated faculties.

Negro teachers are assigned mainly as classroom teachers and librarians. Fifty-five per cent serve as elementary classroom teachers, 25 per cent as secondary classroom teachers, 13.8 per cent as librarians, 1.7 per cent as special teachers, 1.7 per cent as coaches, 1.1 per cent as directors of pupil personnel, and .6 per cent each as band director, guidance counselor, and assistant principal.

Teachers' perceptions of student relations were primarily favorable. White students were perceived to interact freely with both white and Negro teachers. Teachers' responses indicated that Negro students feel slightly less reluctant to interact with Negro teachers than with white teachers. Negro students were reported by 44.4 per cent of the Negro teachers to have indicated that they felt more comfortable and secure with Negro teachers on the faculty. An additional 50.5 per cent perceived that students felt more comfortable, though no students had verbalized this feeling. These responses indicate that Negro students do receive a "psychological lift" when Negro teachers are assigned to faculties of desegregated schools.

A large majority of the teachers perceived no change in discipline problems, while 5.7 per cent reported increases and 11.4 per cent reported decreases in discipline problems.

The responses of teachers in regard to parental relations were most favorable. Negro teachers indicated that they had met more of their homeroom classes' parents and that more of these parents had visited the school than did white teachers. Few homes were visited, but Negro teachers who visited homes said that they were well received. There was little difference in the perceptions of Negro elementary and secondary teachers regarding parental relations. Responses of teachers from both levels were favorable.

Few teachers felt that additional training for service in desegregated faculties is necessary. Courses in intergroup relations were reported as a need by 22.2 per cent of the Negro teachers and 11.9 per cent of the white teachers.

Preparation for the transition to desegregated faculties was reported by only a slight majority of the teachers. Many did not perceive attendance at biracial in-service meetings and professional organizations as preparation because there had been little opportunity for personal contact. Lack of preparation did not result in many teachers having apprehensions, for only 37.5 per cent of the respondents reported that they had apprehensions concerning the change to desegregated faculties.

The perceptions of teachers toward the social relations on desegregated faculties were primarily favorable. Responses of the subjects indicated that there is little hesitation of teachers to visit others' rooms, socialize in the lounge, or accept assignments that call for biracial after-school meetings.

There is still little extra-school fraternization, other than the sharing of rides. Greater desirability on the part of both Negro and white teachers will probably result in more teachers of different races attending church and social functions together.

Teacher reports indicate that they are highly satisfied with their assignments in desegregated faculties. The most satisfying aspect of this experience for Negro teachers has been the opportunity to prove that competency is more important than race in doing an effective job of teaching. White teachers's greatest satisfaction came from the equal treatment of teachers by administrators, which was the second ranked source of satisfaction of Negro teachers. Acceptance of faculty desegregation by students, and the opportunity to exchange ideas with teachers of other races were other high ranking sources of satisfaction. Low ranking sources of satisfaction were "placement of Negro teachers," "favorable change in prestige and status," and "social activities involving white and Negro teachers."

That teachers have formed good relationships and adjusted to the demands of faculty desegregation is confirmed by 88.9 per cent of the total group of teachers reporting that they consider their experience in a desegregated faculty a valuable one. Over 85 per cent of the teachers reported that they enjoy their work as much as in a segregated faculty, feel that additional Negro teachers would not adversely affect the school, and have no desire to return to segregated faculties. Teachers 50 years old and older and those with bachelor's degrees or less gave responses that indicated that they were less satisfied than teachers under 50 years old and those with master's degrees. Little difference was found in responses of elementary and secondary teachers, teachers from large districts and teachers from small districts, teachers attending segregated schools and teachers attending desegregated schools, and teachers of schools with over 10 per cent Negro enrollment and teachers of schools with less than 10 per cent Negro enrollment.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on an analysis of the responses of the subjects included in this study. It is recognized that the responses given are based on the respondents' interpretations of their experiences with faculty desegregation. The analysis of the data appears to justify the following conclusions.

1. The decision to desegregate faculties has been motivated by a number of factors, including (a) the exorbitant cost of operation of Negro schools, (b) the dilapidated state of Negro schools, (c) the decisions of courts, and (d) the tenure status of Negro teachers. The personal conviction of local school officials that faculty desegregation was professionally and morally right and that the transition was inevitable also were factors that influenced the decision to desegregate.

2. A minimum of preparation procedures have been utilized by school officials due to a desire to make the transition to desegregated faculties as quietly and as routinely as possible, and because prior preparation had sufficiently prepared communities for the transition.

3. Various preparation procedures have been utilized by administrators in different districts. School officials used procedures and techniques that their appraisal of readiness and plan for the assignment of teachers indicated would be sufficient to prepare the community for the transition to desegregated faculties. Preparation procedures consisted primarily of exhortation and providing situations whereby Negro teachers would have increased contact with community members and teachers.

4. The prior good human relations that existed between races and the firm favorable attitude of school and community leaders were primarily responsible for the smooth transition to desegregated faculties. Human relations organizations, ministerial associations, and civic and professional organizations had been active in most communities in promoting good human relations. These organizations provided channels of communication through which members of both races could attack common problems.

5. Faculty desegregation has been clearly successful where it has been initiated. Few problems have developed. Students and teachers

accepted Negro teachers readily. Negro teachers have drawn the praise of both parents and administrators.

6. Teachers assigned to desegregated faculties are highly qualified for their teaching responsibilities. Over 40 per cent of the Negro teachers and over 30 per cent of the white teachers have master's degrees. Both groups of teachers have many years of teaching experience.

7. The assignment of Negro teachers as librarians has resulted in many teachers having to take additional training in fields not of their major interest in order to remain employed.

8. Negro and white teachers assigned to desegregated faculties are fully accepted and fairly treated by parents, students, and administrators. Student-teacher interaction is high, parents are well satisfied,and administrators are impartial in their relationships.

9. A relationship seems to exist between teacher satisfaction and both age and level of certification. Teachers over 50 years of age and teachers with bachelor's degrees were less favorable in their responses than teachers under 50 years of age and teachers with master's degrees. No relationship appeared to exist between the satisfaction of teachers and teaching level, size of the districts in which teachers are located, or the percentage of Negro students in the school. No relationship appeared to exist between attendance at a desegregated school and satisfaction. Those teachers who attended segregated schools were as favorable in their responses as teachers who attended desegregated schools.

10. Negro and white teachers are highly satisfied with their assignments in desegregated faculties. A large majority of the teachers consider their experiences valuable ones. They enjoy their work and and have no desire to return to segregated faculties.

11. The outlook for the employment of additional Negro teachers is improving. Over 50 per cent of the administrators indicated a willingness to employ additional Negro teachers. However, Negro teachers will

have to be clearly above average in order to be considered for employment in desegregated faculties.

12. Faculty desegregation can take place in additional school districts in Kentucky with little resistance. The districts that have desegregated faculties are located in all parts of the state. No district in any section of the state reported major problems. There is every reason to expect that the assignment of Negro teachers to all-white faculties can take place in similarly situated districts with little difficulty.

Implications

The two most significant findings from this study are that few problems have resulted from the transition to desegregated faculties and that Negro and white teachers have proved themselves capable of working together cooperatively and harmoniously in the task of educating youth.

Administrators who have been reluctant to initiate the desegregation of faculties for fear of community reactions no longer need have this fear. There is a reservoir of good will and willingness to follow the leadership of school officials who are willing to utilize teachers on the basis of their competencies in providing an improved and expanded program of education. The school leaders who have effected successful faculty desegregation deserve not only to be commended but emulated. A favorable climate for the transition is desirable, but the administrator who waits for everyone in a community to change his attitude will find that this does not happen spontaneously. The prevailing attitude is important but firm positive administrative action can be a determinant of the prevailing attitude. When there are prior good human relations existing in communities, as was the case in the school communities included in this study, it appears that the most limiting factor in the desegregation of faculties is the attitude of the school leaders. It is they who must make the decision to desegregate.

The belief that many parents would not accept Negro teachers has proved unfounded. They not only accept these teachers but respond as favorably to them as they do to white teachers. This reception is related to the excellent job of teaching that is being done by Negro teachers. Administrators from districts where Negro teachers were highly selected and from districts that used tenure status as the primary criterion for selecting Negro teachers both report that faculty desegregation was highly successful. The implication is that success in faculty desegregation does not depend on highly selected Negro teachers, but that good teachers in an all-Negro faculty can be expected to become good teachers in a desegregated faculty.

Teachers who are apprehensive concerning the change to desegregated faculties may be encouraged to know that others have had similar apprehensions but they were soon overcome once the transition was made. Teachers have found that new relationships and patterns of interaction were readily formed. Rejection and hostility that existed soon gave way to acceptance and cooperation. Negro teachers have demonstrated that competence and ability to teach all levels and classes of children does not depend on race but rather on the training and ability of individual teachers. White teachers have gained new insights and a deeper and more complete understanding of human nature from having had the opportunity to exchange ideas with teachers of another race.

However, the conversion of many teachers to librarians implies that there is still reluctance on the part of many school officials to complete the transition to desegregated faculties. Talks with teachers and statements by administrators indicate that many of these teachers would have made excellent classroom teachers. Though serving as librarian is relatively easy work in that no lesson plans must be prepared, no papers must be graded and no cumulative records must be completed, Negro teachers who have settled into these positions represent a kind of token faculty desegregation when there are no other Negro teachers on the staff. To pass up an opportunity to become a regular classroom teacher is to perpetuate this tokenism.

Recommendations

The findings and conclusions resulting from this study lead to the following recommendations:

1. That a special representative be assigned by the State Department of Education to work specifically with local school districts in desegregating faculties and in assigning additional Negro teachers to desegregated faculties;

2. That state boards of education and other official bodies interested in helping solve problems related to faculty desegregation begin to accumulate a body of information concerning faculty desegregation. This information could then be disseminated to local school officials. This procedure would provide these officials with information and moral support in their efforts to effect faculty desegregation in a non-tension provoking manner;

3. That local school boards formulate definite policy statements indicating that teachers will be hired on a non-discriminatory basis, and that promotions will be based on merit, so that presently employed Negro teachers will be encouraged to work for promotions and other Negro teachers will be encouraged to file applications for teaching positions. It is recognized that a policy statement that is not backed up by the firm commitment of school officials becomes little more than window dressing, but a policy statement does provide a starting point for prying away at existing practices and sets the stage for more complete desegregation and integration;

4. That workshops be provided at institutions of higher learning whereby administrators and teachers who have fears and apprehensions concerning faculty desegregation may have them relieved, and whereby ideas for implementing the transition to desegregated faculties may be gained;

5. That teacher training institutions place Negro student teachers in schools with desegregated faculties and segregated white faculties where it is practicable, since many student teachers are employed in school districts in which the student teaching is performed;

6. That all possible efforts be made to place Negro teachers that are assigned to desegregated faculties in their area of certification and greatest competency;

7. That Negro students as well as white ones be made aware of their responsibility to treat all teachers with dignity and respect;

8. That preparation for faculty desegregation be carried out as quietly as possible and that the transition be made with little publicity;

9. That older teachers be given special assistance in adjusting to faculty desegregation since it appears that they are more likely to become dissatisfied with the transition;

10. That a follow-up study to this one be made, probably within five years, to determine the amount of progress in faculty desegregation during that period of time.

APPENDICES

Appendix A—Interview Schedule for Administrators

Appendix B—Interview Schedule for Teachers

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR ADMINISTRATORS

As we indicated in our letter, we would like to ask you some questions concerning your experiences with faculty desegregation. All of the information that you give will be kept in strict confidence. We believe that this research, which your information will help make possible, is needed and will be significant. Therefore, we would appreciate your answering all of the items as accurately as you can. If our questions do not permit you to express adequately your opinions and beliefs, please do not hesitate to make this known.

1. What caused your district to desegregate its faculties?
    a. Wanted to close Negro schools as an economy measure.
    b. Community group petitioned the Board to do so.
    c. Court ordered faculty desegregation.
    d. Realized the inevitability of faculty desegregation.
    e. To expose students to racially different people.
    f. It was felt to be the "right thing" to do.
    g. Other ____________________

2. Did other districts with desegregated faculties influence your decision to desegregate?
    a. Yes ________, b. No __________, c. Very Little ______.

3. (If answer to 2 is "yes") In what way did desegregated faculties of other districts influence the decision in this district?
    a. Led to the belief that this community was ready to accept.
    b. Their desegregation plan was adopted as a model.
    c. Other districts were observed to avoid pitfalls.
    d. Other ____________________

4. What attempt was made to determine readiness of the community for faculty desegregation?
    a. Committee of citizens felt out community attitudes.
    b. Opinion poll conducted among parents.

APPENDIX A—Continued

c. Evaluated progress and acceptance of student desegregation.
c. Evaluated the amount of community desegregation in jobs and public accommodations.
e. Other ____________________

5. In what way was a program of community preparation for the change developed and initiated?
   a. News media were asked to cooperate.
   b. School leaders made speeches.
   c. Negro teachers were placed in positions that would bring them in closer contact with parents and teachers.
   d. Other ____________________

6. Was the change initiated quietly with only the school board, superintendent, and principal being involved?
   a. Yes
   b. No

7. (If the answer to 6 is "no") Who was informed of the decision to desegregate faculties?
   a. Community leaders.
   b. News media.
   c. Teachers.
   d. Parents and students.
   e. Other ____________________

8. What plan was devised to handle teachers, students, and parents who objected to Negro teachers?
   a. Teachers were given the option of transferring to another school or resigning.
   b. Students could transfer to another teacher or school.
   c. Negro teachers were given only elective classes.
   d. Parents were asked to make requests on the basis of incompetency rather than race.
   e. Parents were polled as to whether they objected to their children being taught by a teacher of different racial origin.
   f. Other ____________________

9. How were Negro teachers chosen who would desegregate faculties?
   a. All Negro teachers on tenure.
   b. Teachers were screened from among those chosen by their principal.

APPENDIX A—Continued

   c. Negro teachers were chosen from among those who indicated they did not object to being transferred into a formerly all-white faculty.
   d. The superintendent and principal of the desegregating faculty chose the Negro teachers on the basis of professional qualifications.
   e. Other ____________________

10. What orientation programs were carried on for students that were involved in faculty desegregation?
   a. Reading material on human relations and civil rights were prepared for students.
   b. Students were shown films and encouraged to read books and articles about Negroes.
   c. Students staged plays, held forums, and formed welcoming committees for teachers.
   e. No orientation program was felt needed.
   f. Other ____________________

11. What orientation was provided for teachers of faculties to be desegregated?
   a. Teachers visited Negro teachers' school.
   b. Professional meetings desegregated.
   c. Teachers served on committees with Negro teachers.
   d. Workshop on intergroup relations was held for teachers.
   e. No orientation.
   f. Other ____________________

12. Was a policy statement issued by the board and superintendent stating their reasons for and commitment to faculty desegregation, stressing
   a. Preservation of tenure rights.
   b. Transfer of teachers to meet the needs of the service.
   c. Employment based on competency.
   d. Economy move.
   e. Broadening of educational opportunity.
   f. Promotion on merit.
   g. Other ____________________

13. What changes would you make in your preparation for faculty desegregation if you had to do it all over again?
   a.

APPENDIX A—Continued

b.

c.

14. How were Negro teachers placed originally?
    a. Non-teaching positions
        1) Secretary
        2) Librarian
        3) Lunchroom supervisor
        4) Counselor
        5) Bus driver
        6) Other ____________
    b. Semi-teaching positions (teaching and one of above).
    c. Full-time teaching positions.
    d. Principal or assistant principal.
    e. Other ______________________

15. Why did you choose the plan of placement mentioned?
    a. Felt it was more acceptable to the community.
    b. Negro teachers needed time to get orientated.
    c. So students could get used to seeing a Negro on the faculty.
    d. Negro teachers were not ready to enter the classroom.
    e. Other ______________________

16. Was there a plan to gradually shift all Negro teachers to full-time teaching positions?
    a. No plan.
    b. Over a period of years.
    c. Year following the year faculty desegregation was initiated.
    d. Other ______________________

17. How many resignations and requests for transfers were received from teachers during the years faculties have been desegregated?
    a. First year _______.
    b. Second year ______.
    c. Third year _______.
    d. Other years ______.

18. What was the average number of resignation and requests for transfers received per year from teachers prior to the desegregation of faculties?

APPENDIX A—Continued

18. How many requests for transfers of students from Negro teachers' classes have been received?
    - a. First year ______.
    - b. Second year ______.
    - c. Third year ______.
    - d. Other years ______.

20. Are there any plans by the school board to hire additional Negro teachers for desegregated faculties?
    - a. Teachers will be hired on merit, not race.
    - b. Negro teachers will be considered for positions that are hard to fill.
    - c. Will hire additional Negro elementary teachers.
    - d. Will hire additional Negro secondary teachers.
    - e. Not considering hiring additional Negro teachers.
    - f. Other ________________

21. If your district had to start desegregation of faculties all over again, what procedures would you omit that were used?

22. What procedures would be utilized that were omitted if it were possible to start over?

23. In general, would you say that faculty desegregation in your school (district) has been successful?

APPENDIX A—Continued

24. In your opinion what conditions in the community made the change possible?

25. Can you identify any factors which worked against the change?

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TEACHERS

We would like to ask you some questions concerning your experiences with faculty desegregation. All of the information that you give will be kept in strict confidence. We believe that this research, which your information will help make possible, is needed and will be significant. Therefore, we would appreciate your answering all of the items as accurately as you can. If our questions do not permit you to express adequately your opinions and beliefs, please do not hesitate to make this known.

Sex:
Male _____
Female _____

Race:
Negro _____
White _____

Age range:
20-29 _____
30-39 _____
40-49 _____
50-59 _____
60-69 _____

Location:
District ________________
School ________________

Level:
Elementary _____
Junior high _____
Senior high _____

Marital Status:
Single _____
Married _____
Divorced _____
Widowed _____

Type of schools attended:
Desegregated
Elementary _______
Secondary _________
Undergraduate _____
Graduate _________

APPENDIX B—Continued

Percentage of students

In school: In classes met per day:

Negro ________% Negro ________%

White ________% White ________%

1. How much professional and academic preparation have you had?
   a. Less than four years.
   b. Four years or over but less than five.
   c. Five years.
   d. Five years plus 15 semester hours or over but less than six.
   e. Six years or over.

2. At what level and in what areas are you certified to teach?
   a. Elementary classroom.
   b. Secondary classroom. Subjects ____________________
   c. Guidance and counseling.
   d. Library service.
   e. Administration.
   f. Other ____________________

3. In what areas were you certified to teach prior to teaching as a part of a desegregated faculty?
   a. Elementary classroom.
   b. Secondary classroom. Subjects ____________________
   c. Guidance and counseling.
   d. Library service.
   e. Administration.
   f. Other ____________________

4. In what position are you now serving?
   a. Elementary teacher.
   b. Secondary teacher. Subjects ____________________
   c. Guidance counselor, Director of pupil personnel.
   d. Principal, Assistant Principal, Supervisor.
   e. Librarian.
   f. Secretary.
   g. Special teacher
   h. Other ____________________

APPENDIX B—Continued

5. In what position were you serving prior to entering a desegregated faculty?
   a. Elementary teacher.
   b. Secondary teacher. Subjects ____________________
   c. Guidance counselor, Director of pupil personnel.
   d. Principal, Assistant Principal, Supervisor
   e. Librarian.
   f. Other ______________

6. Did you have to take additional training as a result of faculty desegregation? Yes ____. No _____.
   (If "yes") In which area? ____________________

7. Were you on tenure or continuing contract when you began serving on a desegregated faculty? Yes ____. No ____.
   (If "yes") Number of years ____________

8. In what positions and how many years have you served on a desegregated faculty?
   a. First year _______ c. Third year ________
   b. Second year ______ d. Total no. of years ____

9. How many years did you teach prior to entering a desegregated faculty?
   a. None c. 5-8 e. 13-16 g. Over
   b. 1-4 d. 9-12 f. 17-20 20 ______

10. Do students of your race come to you to discuss topics of a general and personal nature?
    a. Very often c. Sometimes e. Never
    b. Often d. Seldom

11. Do students not of your race come to you to discuss topics of a general and personal nature?
    a. Very often c. Sometimes e. Never
    b. Often d. Seldom

12. (For Negro teachers) Have Negro students indicated to you that they feel less alone and less alienated now that you are a part of the faculty?
    a. A few (1-5) c. A large number (11-15)
    b. Several (6-10) d. Many (16-20) e. Over 20

APPENDIX A—Continued

13. Has there been any change in the attitude of Negro students since the faculty was desegregated, as evidenced by
    a. Participation and cooperation decreased.
    b. More racial incidents.
    c. Participation and cooperation increased.
    d. Fewer racial incidents.
    e. Students appear less alone and less withdrawn.
    f. Other ________________________

14. What extra-curricular duties are you assigned that involve working with students other than in the classroom?
    a. Supervises lunchroom and playground.
    b. Chaperones games and dances.
    c. Advises classes.
    d. Sponsors clubs and organizations.
    e. Serves as coah or band director.
    f. Serves as dramatics or choral director.
    g. Other ________________________

15. Has direction of extra-curricular activities by Negro teachers affected the acceptance of these teachers by students and parents?
    a. Facilitated acceptance much.
    b. Facilitated acceptance some but not much.
    c. Did not affect acceptance.
    d. Slowed up acceptance.
    e. Other ________________________

16. Have you noticed any change in the number and kind of discipline problems since the faculty was desegregated?
    a. More petty problems.
    b. Fewer petty problems.
    c. More major problems.
    d. Fewer major problems.
    e. Other ________________________

17. Do you hold an office or position in the local district teachers association?
    a. President or Vice President.
    b. Treasurer or Vice Treasurer.
    c. Secretary or Assistant Secretary.
    d. Parliamentarian.
    e. Committee chairman or member.
    f. Other ________________________

APPENDIX B—Continued

18. Do you hold an office or position such as those previously mentioned in the Kentucky Education Association?
Position ____________________________

19. Do you hold an office or position such as those previously mentioned in the parent-teacher association?
Position ____________________________

20. What is the relationship of Negro parents with the PTA of your school?
    a. Officer(s).
    b. Committee chairman.
    c. Committee member.
    d. Several attend regularly.
    e. Attendance is low.
    f. None attend.

21. Estimate as accurately as possible the answers to the following questions:
    a. Per cent of homeroom class's parents attending PTA ________%.
    b. Per cent of homeroom class's parents that you have personally met _______%.
    c. Per cent of homeroom class's parents that have visited the school on invitation at various times _______%.
    d. Per cent of homeroom class's homes you have visited ______%.
    e. Average per cent of all parents attending various school functions ________%.

22. Does your experience indicate that the longer a faculty is desegregated the better accepted minority teachers become?
    a. Acceptance is unchanged.
    b. A slight increase in acceptance.
    c. Increase in acceptance is proportional to length of time.
    d. A slight decrease in acceptance.
    e. A definite decrease in acceptance.
    f. Other __________________________

APPENDIX B—Continued

23. Does your experience indicate that additional preparation in certain fields would have helped teachers become better prepared to teach in a desegregated faculty? __________. (If "yes") In what fields?
   a. Intergroup relations.
   b. Academic subjects.
   c. Special training in how to handle problems arising from racial differences, e.g., name calling, racial remarks, etc.
   d. Negro history and accomplishments.
   e. Other ________________________

24. What special preparation was given teachers who were to become a part of desegregated faculties?
   a. No preparation.
   b. Consultations were held with superintendent and/or principal.
   c. Participated in desegregated in-service programs.
   d. Attended intergroup relations workshop.
   e. Other ________________________

25. Do you ever visit the rooms of teachers not of your race during the school day to discuss problems or for other reasons?
   a. Never.
   b. Very seldom.
   c. As much as other teachers do.
   d. Many times.
   e. Whenever the need or inclination arises.
   f. Quite often.

26. What was the basis of your apprehensions about entering a desegregated faculty?
   a. No apprehensions.
   b. Thought administrators would be unfair to Negro teachers.
   c. Felt Negro teachers would not be happy in desegregated faculties.
   d. Felt that parents would not accept Negro teachers.
   e. Felt that students would not accept Negro teachers.
   f. Felt that Negro teachers would not be judged on merit.
   g. Concerned about ability to perform competently as a teacher.
   h. Other ________________________

APPENDIX B—Continued

27. Do teachers not of your race visit your classroom during the school day to discuss problems of for other reasons?
    a. Never.
    b. Very seldom.
    c. As much as other teachers do.
    d. Many times.
    e. Whenever the need or inclination arises.
    f. Quite often.

28. If a teacher on your faculty, not of your race, entered the teachers' lounge and the only vacant seat was on a sofa next to you, what do you think the teacher would do?
    a. Remain standing.
    b. Leave the lounge.
    c. Sit in the vacant seat.
    d. Remain standing for a short time then leave.
    e. Other ______________________

29. If you were nominated in a faculty meeting to serve as co-chairman of a committee along with a teacher not of your race that would involve after school meetings in a social situation, would you:
    a. Accept the nomination.
    b. Accept the nomination with reservation to resign later.
    c. Decline without explanation.
    d. Decline with explanation.
    e. Other ______________________

30. As a result of your experience, do you feel that faculty desegregation of all districts should:
    a. Be on a voluntary basis.
    b. Be limited to districts with biracial student bodies.
    c. Be guaranteed in all districts by court decree.
    d. Be extended to all districts on a voluntary basis.
    e. Be carried out only in those districts where the community is not opposed to it.
    f. Other ______________________

APPENDIX B—Continued

31. To what extent is there extra-school fraternizing among you and teachers not of your race?
    - a. Have lunch together at noon.
    - b. Ride home or to town together.
    - c. Invite each other to dinner.
    - d. Attend social functions together.
    - e. Attend church together.
    - f. No contact after school.
    - g. Other ________________________

33. To what extent do you feel that extra-school fraternizing among you and teachers not of your race would be desirable?
    - a. Have lunch together at noon.
    - b. Ride home or to town together.
    - c. Invite each other to dinner.
    - d. Attend social functions together.
    - e. Attend church together.
    - f. No contact after school.
    - g. Other ___________________________

APPENDIX B—Continued

Rank in order the degree of satisfaction derived from these desegregated conditions. Rank the aspect most pleasing as (1).

Chance to exchange ideas with teachers of another race. ________

Acceptance of faculty desegregation by students. ________

Change in student behavior ________

Favorable change in prestige and status. ________

Placement of Negro teachers. ________

Acceptance and "fitting-in" behaviors of teachers of the other race. ________

Chance to prove that it's the competency, not race of a teacher that counts. ________

Acceptance of Negro teachers by parents. ________

Social activities involving Negro and white teachers. ________

Equal treament of teachers by administrators. ________

Please give examples of the experiences that pleased you least (the three lowest ranked aspects).

1. ____

____

____

2. ____

____

____

3. ____

____

____

APPENDIX B—Continued

Below is a series of statements; please indicate the response that best describes your general reaction to each statement

	Yes very much 1	Yes 2	Cannot decide 3	No 4	No definitely 5
I consider my experience in a desegregated faculty a valuable one that I would not have wanted to miss.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel that the Negro teachers are treated fairly in every respect by administrators.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel that Negro teachers on the faculty have led to a reduction of prejudice and greater respect for Negroes.	1	2	3	4	5
I enjoy my work as much in a desegregated faculty as I did in a segregated one.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel that additional Negro teachers would not adversely affect our school.	1	2	3	4	5
I had apprehensions about faculty desegregation but they have disappeared.	1	2	3	4	5
I regret having decided to work in a desegregated faculty.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel that my fellow teachers consider working in a desegregated faculty a pleasant and valuable experience.	1	2	3	4	5
Our Negro teachers worked harder than other teachers to prove that Negro teachers are not inferior.	1	2	3	4	5
If conditions were favorable, I'd like to return to a segregated faculty.	1	2	3	4	5

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Ashmore, Harry S. The Negro and the Schools. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954.

Bond, Horace Mann. The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1934.

Brickman, William W. and Lehrer, Stanley. The Countdown on Segregated Education. New York: Society for the Advancement of Education, 1960.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carmichael, Omer and James, Weldon. The Louisville Story. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957.

[illegible] Politics of School Desegregation. [illegible]

Dean, John P. and Rosen, Alex. A Manual of Intergroup Relations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

[illegible] of School Desegregation. New York: [illegible] for the Advancement of Education, 1957.

[illegible], Lewis M. [illegible]. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, [illegible]

Hill, Herbert and Greenberg, Jack. Citizen's Guide to Desegregation. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1955.

Humphrey, Hubert H. (ed.). Integration vs. Segregation. New York: T. Y. Crowell Company, 1964.

Kentucky Department of Education. History of Education in Kentucky. Frankfort: Kentucky Department of Education, 1914.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Ashmore, Harry S. The Negro and the Schools. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954.

Bond, Horace Mann. The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order. New York: Prentice Hall, 1934.

Brickman, William W. and Lehrer, Stanley. The Countdown on Segregated Education. New York: Society for the Advancement of Education, 1960.

Carmichael, Omer and James, Weldon. The Louisville Story. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957.

Corey, John and Wey, Herbert. Action Patterns in School Desegregation. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa,Incorporated, 1957.

Dean, John and Rosen, Alex. A Manual of Intergroup Relations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry. Psychiatric Aspects of School Desegregation. New York: Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, 1957.

Harlan, Louis R. Separate and Unequal. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958.

Hill, Herbert and Greenberg, Jack. Citizens Guide to Desegregation. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1955.

Humphrey, Hubert H. (ed.). Integration vs. Segregation. New York: T. Y. Crowell Company, 1963.

Kentucky Department of Education. History of Education in Kentucky. Frankfort: Kentucky Department of Education, 1914.

Knox, Ellis O. Democracy and the District of Columbia Public Schools. Washington: Judd and Deweiler Incorporated, 1957.

Ligon, Mose E. A History of Public Education in Kentucky. Bulletin of the Bureau of School Services; Vol. XIV, No. 4: Lexington: University of Kentucky, 1942.

Logan, Rayford. The Negro in the United States—A Brief History. Washington: Van Nostrand, 1957.

Lott, Albert J. and Lott, Bernice E. Negro and White Youth. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Incorporated, 1961.

Meece, Leonard E. Negro Education in Kentucky. Bulletin of the Bureau of School Services; Vol. X, No. 3; Lexington: University of Kentucky, 1938.

National Education Association, NEA Handbook 1963-64. Washington: National Education Association, 1963.

Pierce, Truman, et al. White and Negro Schools in the South. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1955.

Rose, Arnold. The Negro in America. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944.

Shoemaker, Don. With All Deliberate Speed. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Suchman, Edward A., et al. Desegregation: Some Propositions and Research Suggestions. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1958.

Tumin, Melvin. Desegregation—Resistance and Readiness. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.

Williams, Robin M. and Ryan, Margaret. Schools in Transition. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954.

Articles and Periodicals

Chattanooga Times. (Thursday, July 9, 1964), p. 11.

Clark, Kenneth. "Desegregation: An Appraisal of the Evidence," Journal of Social Issues, IX, No. 4 (1953), pp. 1-79.

Coleman, A. Lee. "Desegregation of Public Schools in Kentucky—One Year Afterwards," Journal of Negro Education, XXIV (Spring, 1955), p. 256.

________. "Desegregation in the Public Schools of Kentucky—Second Year After the Supreme Court Decision," Journal of Negro Education, XXV (Summer, 1956), pp. 254-261.

________, and Kaplan, Sidney. Faculty Integration in Public Schools. Publication of the Kentucky Commission on Human Rights (January, 1962), pp. 1-10.

________. "The Strategy of Change: Contrasting Approaches to Teacher Integration," Social Science, XXXVIII (October, 1963), p. 218.

Courier Journal (May 18, 1954), Sec. 1, pp. 1, 3, 6.

Deutsch, Martin. "Some Perspectives on Desegregation Research," The Role of the Social Sciences in Desegregation: A Symposium, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (1956), p. 6.

Doddy, Hurley R. and Edwards, G. G. "Apprehensions of Negro Teachers Concerning Desegregation in South Carolina," Journal of Negro Education, XXIV (Winter, 1955), p. 27.

Doddy, Hurley R. "Desegregation and the Employment of Negro Teachers," Journal of Negro Education, XXIV (Fall, 1955), pp. 405-408.

Dodson, Dan W. "Toward Integration," The Journal of Educational Sociology, XXVII (October, 1954), pp. 50-58.

Dwyer, Robert J. "The Negro Teacher and Desegregation," Sociology and Social Research, XLII (September-October, 1957), pp. 27-36.

Gandy, Willard E. "Implications of Integration for the Southern Negro Teacher," Journal of Negro Education, XXXI (April, 1962), pp. 191-197.

Jordan, Lawrence V. "Educational Integration in West Virginia One Year Afterwards," Journal of Negro Education, XXIV (Summer, 1955), pp. 276-279.

Hobson, Carol J. and Schloss, Samuel. "Enrollment, Teachers, and Schoolhousing," U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Circular No. 703 (1962).

Leeson, Jim. "The First Ten Years," Phi Delta Kappan, XLV (May, 1964), p. 262-263.

Mackenzie, Barbara. "The Importance of Contact in Determining Attitudes toward Negroes," Journal of Abnormal Psychology (October, 1954), pp. 50-58.

Mays, Nebraska. "Behavioral Expectations of Negro and White Teachers on Recently Desegregated Public School Faculties," Journal of Negro Education, XXXII (Summer, 1963), pp. 218-226.

Morris, Mortimer. "Let's Integrate Our Teachers Too," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXIX (June, 1958), p. 361.

Phi Delta Kappan. (editorial), XLV (May, 1964), p. 361.

Race Relations Law Reporter, VIII, Vanderbilt University School of Law (Spring-Summer, 1963), pp. 945-950.

Robinson, Glen. "Caught in the Crossfire," The Nation's Schools, LIX (January, 1959), p. 68.

Southern School News (June, 1955), p. 7.

Southern School News (February, 1964), pp. 1-16.

Southern School News (May, 1964), pp. 262-263.

Southern School News (July, 1964), p. 3.

Public Documents

Commonwealth of Kentucky. Kentucky Common School Laws, 1962. Frankfort: Kentucky Department of Education, XXX, No. 5.

Commonwealth of Kentucky. Kentucky Revised Statutes (Baldwin, 1943).

Commonwealth of Kentucky. Kentucky Revised Statutes (Baldwin's Annotated Revision of Carroll's Statutes, 1936).

Commonwealth of Kentucky. Kentucky School Directory 1963-64. Frankfort: Kentucky Department of Education, XXXI, No. 10 (October, 1963).

Commonwealth of Kentucky. Integration in Public Education: Report of Eight Years of Progress. Frankfort: Kentucky Department of Education (November, 1963).

Unpublished Materials

Commonwealth of Kentucky. "Opinion of the Office of the Attorney General of Kentucky," OAG 62-759 (August, 1962).

Commonwealth of Kentucky. "Minutes of the Quarterly Meetings of the Kentucky Board of Education," June 23, 1955-December 16, 1964.

Reuter, Frederick W. P. "A Study of Thirty Techniques Used and Thirty-two Conditions under Which They Were Used to Desegregate Successfully 146 Schools or School Systems in Eleven Southern and Border States." Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, New York University, 1961.

Spruill, Albert Westley. "Consequences Encountered by Negro Teachers in the Process of Desegregation of Schools in Four Southern States." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Cornell University, 1958.

Tate, Horace E. "Some Characteristics and Perceptions of the Negro Undergraduate of the University of Kentucky." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1960.

Wiley, Alfred D. "A Study of Desegregation in the Evansville School Corporation, Evansville, Indiana." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Indiana University, 1961.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

The writer was born on a farm in Burke County, Georgia, on April 14, 1933. He attended elementary schools in Burke County and Jefferson County, Georgia. He graduated from Jefferson County Training School, Louisville, Georgia, in June, 1949.

Undergraduate training was received at Paine College, Augusta, Georgia, from September, 1949, to June, 1953. Upon graduation, the writer began a career of teaching in the public schools of Georgia that lasted for ten years. The last eight of these years were spent as a teacher and assistant principal in the public schools of Richmond County, Georgia. While serving in this capacity, the M. A. in Ed. degree was received from Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri, in 1961.

In September, 1963, upon being awarded a Southern Education Foundation Fellowship to study at the University of Kentucky, the writer began work leading toward the doctorate degree.

The writer was quite active in professional organizations during during his tenure in public school education. From September, 1960, to June, 1963, he served as chairman of the Welfare Committee of the Richmond County Teachers Association. In July 1961, he was a delegate to the National Education Association Convention from the previously mentioned organization. He was selected as the 1963 Teacher-of-the-Year for Region V of the Georgia Teachers and Education in February, 1963.

Eddie W. Morris
Eddie W. Morris

May, 1965
(Date)